

# Islam and Modernism

اسلام اور مدنیت پرستی

By

MUFTI MUHAMMAD TAQI USMANI

Translated By

Dr. Mohammed Swaleh Siddiqui

Revised & Edited By:

Mohammad Wali Raazi

## FOREWORD

For the last twenty seven years I have been writing on different aspects of the practical implementation of Islam and Islamic solution of ever new problems arising in the different spheres of life. Most of those articles were being published in the monthly Journal "ALBALAGH". A collection of such articles had been published in Urdu about seventeen years ago under the caption "Asr-e-Hazir Mein Islam Kaiysay Nafiz Ho?" (How to Implement Islam in the present time?) comprising of about 750 pages.

Even after the publication of this book I had the opportunity of writing on other aspects of the same subject, and friends expressed a desire that these latter articles may also be included in the same book. But I found that an addition of these articles in that book would make it a voluminous book, making it difficult for the readers to get full benefit from it. Further, these articles pertained to different topics like politics, law, economy, education, social life and individual reforms, etc., and a book of that size would have a disadvantage for those who would be interested in a single topic for which they would have to buy the whole book, many of whose articles may not be of their interest. For this reason I thought that it would be more appropriate to compile articles on different subjects separately, rather than collecting them in one book. I, therefore, rearranged my articles under the following titles and published them in the form of booklets in Urdu.

1. Implementation of Islamic Law and its problems.
2. Islam and present day politics.
3. Islam and Modernism.
4. Our Education System.
5. Reforming the Conduct of an Individual.
6. The life and message of the Holy Prophet (Sallal la ho Alay hi wassallam).
7. Reforms in the Social Life.
8. Our Economic System.
9. Muslims and Qadiyanism.

Of these nine collections the one “Islam aur Jiddat Pasandi” was published about two years ago and its English version is now being presented under the name of “Islam and Modernism”.

May Almighty Allah make it beneficial for the Muslims and may it be a source of Allah’s reward in the Hereafter.

Muhammad Taqi Usmani.

# CHAPTER 1

## ISLAM AND MODERNISM

Search for “Modernity” by itself is a commendable desire and a natural urge of humankind. If this urge was not there, man would not have reached from stone-age to atomic era, could not have gained access to aero-planes and spacecrafts from camels and bullock carts, nor would have progressed to electric bulbs and search lights from wax candles and earthen lamps. All these material advancements and scientific achievements, which have put nooses on the planets and conducted their buckets to the bottom of sea, are in fact an importunate effect of man’s inherent trait that he is a “modernist” and avaricious of “better to best” achievements.

Hence Islam, being a natural religion, is not opposed to modernism as far as it implies to be modern in the simple sense of the word. Very often it has been appreciated and given due encouragement. Particularly the use of latest and newer methods in industry and craft and war technologies is proved from prophetic traditions. On the occasion of battle of Ahz' ab when the tribes of Arabia joined together and raided Madina, a renowned companion Salman F'arsi suggested a new technique for its defence which was never practiced in Arabia before. He suggested digging of a trench around the city. This was hailed by the Prophet (PBUH) and he himself took part in digging the trench (Al-bidayah wan-Nih'ayah 4:95)

On the advice of Salman F' arsi the Prophet used two new weapons in the battle of Ta'if which, according to some narration, were constructed by Salman himself. One of them was a ‘catapult’ which served as a cannon of the time; the second was “Dababah” the Tank of the time (Albidayah wan-Nih'ayah 4:95).

Not only this, but Ibn-e-Kathir has reported that the Prophet (PBUH) had sent two of his companions, namely ‘Urwah Ibn Mas'ud and Ghitan Ibn Salmah to the city of Jarash in Syria to learn the techniques of manufacturing Dababas, Manjaniq (catapult) and Dhabur. Jarash was the famous industrial town of Syria and Dhabur was a weapon similar to Dababa which was used by Romans in their wars. These two companions could not take

part in the battle of Hunayn and Ta’if because they were in Syria learning this technology (Tabqat-e-Ibne-Sa’ad vol 2, p. 221, Tarikh Tabri p. 353 vol. 2., Albidayah wan-Nih’ ayah p.345 vol 4).

Ibn-e-Jarir has reported that the Prophet (PBUH) had asked the people of Madinah to promote agriculture by increased cultivation and use of camel skulls in their fields for increased production (Kinzul-’Ammal p.199 vol: 2).

According to one narration the Prophet advised people to promote their business by increasing trade in clothes because a cloth-merchant always wishes that the people remain prosperous and free from worries (Kanz-ul ‘Ammal p.199, vol. 2).

Also he persuaded many people to go to Oman and Egypt for trade (Kanz-ul-’Ammal p.197, vol. 2)

To get the benefits of agriculture and minerals he said:

اطلبوا الرزق في خباب الأرض

(Seek your living in the hidden wealth of the Earth) (Kanz-ul ‘Ammal p.197, vol. 2).

The people of Arabia were ignorant of naval fleet, but the Prophet (PBUH) had joyously predicted that some of his people will travel through the sea for Jeh’ ad in the way of Allah as if they are kings on a throne (Sahih Bukhari, kitab-ul-Jeh ad). He described several virtues of the first naval fleet of the Muslims. Consequently Hadhrat Mu’awiyah (RA) prepared the first naval fleet during the caliphate of Hadhrat Usman Ghani (RA). This enabled the access of Muslims to Cyprus, Rhodes, Crates and Sicily and then the entire Mediterranean Sea came under their command.

Hadhrat ‘Amr bin ‘Aas (RA) in the year 8.AH used the method of “Blackout” during the war of Zat-us-salasil against Lakhm and Juzam, and ordered his troops that there should be no lights nor any fire kindled for three nights in the battlefield. When the troops reached Madinah and the Prophet (PBUH) came to know of it he inquired the reasons for this action. ‘Amr bin ‘Aas replied “O Messenger of Allah, my troops were less in number than the enemy troops, hence I ordered to keep all lights off at night lest the enemy may boost its morale by finding the low count of our troops”. The

Prophet was pleased with this tactic and offered his thanks to Almighty Allah (Jam'a -ul-Fawa'id p. 27, vol.2).

These are a few examples of the Prophetic era which have been casually mentioned. The aim of this description was to emphasize that Islam has not objected to any modern advancement just because it is recent and modern. Rather it has encouraged modernity for rightful purposes and within rightful limits.

However, in its own sphere it remains a reality that whereas modernity has elevated man's material status to great heights, given him newer inventions and provided him with better means of comfort and ease in life, it has, at the same time, caused man to suffer from many depravities and led him to many disastrous ends. It is due to the same modernity that human history is full of Pharaohs and Shiddads who were not contented with any limit of power and authority. Their lust for authority took them to the extent of claiming deification for themselves. The same modernity gave birth to Hitler and Mussolini whose ever increasing urge for expanding territorial boundaries demanded a new piece of land every day. It is the same modernity that has engulfed the whole world in the tornado of nudity and obscenity, and has provided an excuse for fornication, and more so it has led, under thunder claps to the passage of a bill in the British House of Commons to legalize homosexuality. It is in the shadow of the same modernity that Western women are openly displaying banners on the streets demanding legalization of abortion. And it is the same modernity which is providing argument for justifying marriage with true sisters, daughters and other blood relations.

It proves that "Modernity" is a double-edged sword which can be used for the benefit of mankind and to cut its own throat. Hence any new thing is neither acceptable just for being new nor refutable just because it is new. That much is clear and obvious but the most important question is, "What is the criterion to decide which invention is useful and acceptable and which is harmful and not acceptable?"

One way to determine this standard is to follow the dictates of reason alone. Hence, in secular societies this decision rests with logic and reasoning. But the difficulty in it is that those people who robbed humanity of all the attributes of morality and character in

the name of ‘Modernity’ and put it on the road to barbarism and brutality were all men of reason and philosophy, and there were none among them who had not made pure intellect as their guide. The reason is that once free of the Divine Guidance of Wahy ‘intellect’ becomes a beloved of every Tom, Dick and Harry, so that each of the different kinds of contradictory elements, consider it to be their exclusive property, while in fact it belongs to none of them. In such an “Intellect” one can find glamorous justifications for every evil concept and filthiest of action. For example, the names of Hiroshima and Nagasaki cause humanity to sweat with shame, but the scholarly and world-famous book “Encyclopedia Britannica” has mentioned the disasters caused by Atomic Bombs in these cities after the introductory sentence as follows:

“Former Prime Minister Winston Churchill estimated that by shortening the war the Atomic Bomb had saved the lives of 10,000,000 US soldiers and 250,000 British soldiers”. (Britannica vol.2. p. 647, 1950).

Several examples of similar rational interpretations can be presented. With due apologies to modesty I would like to present another example in the light of which the correct position of pure intellect would become clear.

In the history of Islam there has passed a sect known as ‘Batiniyah’. A renowned leader of this sect Ubayd-ullah alQirwani has written:

وَمَا أَنْجَبَ مِنْ شَيْءٍ كَعَجْبٍ مِنْ رَجُلٍ يَدْعُى الْعُقْلَ ثُمَّ يَكُونُ لَهُ أَخْتٌ أَوْ بَنْتٌ حَسَنَاءَ،  
وَلَيْسَ لَهُ زَوْجَةٌ فِي حَسَنَاهَا فَيُحِرِّمُهَا عَلَى نَفْسِهِ وَيَنْكِحُهَا مِنْ أَجْنَبٍ وَلَوْ عَقْلٌ الْجَاهِلُ  
لَعِمْ (نَسَا أَحْقَ بِأَخْتِهِ وَبَنْتِهِ) مِنَ الْأَجْنَبِيِّ وَمَا وَجَهَ ذَالِكَ إِلَّا أَنْ صَاحِبَهُ حَرَمَ  
عَلَيْهِمَا الطَّيِّبَاتِ (الْخَ)

(الفرق بين الفرق لعبد القاهر البغدادي ص ٢٩ طبع مصر)

“What can be more surprising that a person having claim to wisdom acts so stupidly that he has with him a beautiful sister or daughter. His wife is not so pretty, he marries his daughter or sister to a stranger. If these ignorant ones had any trace of wisdom they would have known that they themselves had a greater right on their sisters and daughters than a stranger. The main reason of this stupidity is that their Master has forbidden good things on them.”

No matter how you react to this disgusting and repulsive statement, it is an obvious example of what havoc is caused by human reason when it is not guided by Divine Guidance. What argument is there with reason to reject this hideous suggestion of marrying ones real daughter and sister? Hence we see that the dream of 'Ubayd-ulla Qirwani is coming true centuries afterwards, and voices are being raised in some Western countries to legalise marriages with real sisters.

In short, carried away by the wave of Modernity, if the decision for good and bad is left on reason alone the result will be that no value of life will remain intact. Besides, man will be lost in the labyrinth of contradictory opinions and concepts from which no way out can be traced. The intellectual level of every person is different from the other. The reason is that, independence from the Divine Guidance of Wahy is regarded by man as freedom, but in fact he becomes the slave of his beastly passions and sensual desires. This, is the worst form of servility. In the Qur'anic phraseology it is termed as Haw-a( حُوَاءٌ) that is passion, and it is about this that the Qur'an declared:

وَلَوْا تَبَعَ الْحَقَّ أَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ فَنَسَدَتِ الْسَّمَاوَاتُ وَالْأَرْضُ وَمَنْ فِيهِنَّ -

“If Truth becomes subjected to their passions great tumult will occur between the earth and skies and the creations therein.”

(23:71)

A group of philosophers has been mentioned in the discussions of Legal Theory. Their concept of morality is called the Cognivist Theory. The famous legal expert Dr. Friedman has summarized this view in his book “Legal Theory” in these words:

“Reason is and ought only to be the slave of the passions and can never pretend to any other office than to serve and obey them” (p.36)

The end result to be derived from this view, in the words of Dr. Friedman, is:

“Every thing else but also words like ‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘ought’, ‘worthy’ are purely emotive, and there cannot be such thing as ethical or moral science” (pp.36-37).

However bad or wrong this view may be to form the basis of moral conceptions, it provides a true and realistic interpretation of secular reasoning. Factually, there can be no other outcome of submission to secular reason that no such thing as “Morality” should exist in the world, and nothing but passions should govern the words and deeds of man. In fact secular reasoning and ‘morality’ can never go together because a stage is arrived in the pursuit of ‘modernity’ when a man’s conscience regards an action as bad yet he feels bound to adopt it because ‘modernity’ and secular reasoning offer no argument to reject it. The western thinkers of today are helplessly facing the same predicament. A large number of British thinkers do not like the legalization of homosexuality adopted by the Parliament a few years ago but they were obliged to accept it because in the doctrine of a purely intellectual “modernity” there remains no option but to legalize every evil that has prevailed in the society. How admonishing are the words of the Wolfenden Committee which was appointed to consider this issue:

“Unless a deliberate attempt is made by society acting through the agency of the law to equate this fear of crime with that of sin, there must remain a realm of private morality and immorality which in brief and crude terms is not the law’s business.” (The Legal Theory).

In fact, once reason alone is made a judge to decide what is good and bad Man will be deprived of every standard that may be used as a basis to stop a new practice harmful to society. Reason has to be made to follow Divine standard of good and bad.

The law-makers are extremely worried that in the presence of the general trend of modernity what method can be adopted through which at least some exalted human values might be preserved. An American judge Cardozo has written that the most important legal need of today is that a philosophy of law should be organized which could create a harmony between the contradictory and antagonistic demands of stationary and revolutionary values. But the fact is that this job cannot be done through reason and philosophy. The entire disruption has started because the function of Wahy (Divine Revelations) has been imposed on the intellect of Man and in this way a burden has been placed on his shoulders which he cannot bear. It is only on the basis of some valid arguments that a law can be called perpetual and free of changes,

but the human intellect is incapable of producing any such argument. Today some people may regard a law as unalterable on the basis of their reasons but tomorrow others may realize that it is not fit to be a perpetual law and they would declare it alterable. The only solution to the problem is that instead of making himself a slave of his passions he should submit to the Being Who created him and the entire universe. Since that Being is fully aware of all the changes that would occur, no body else can determine which principles of law are unalterable.

The famous author of jurisprudence, George Paton, has written:

“What interests should the real legal system protect? This is a question of values in which legal philosophy plays its part.... But however much we desire the help of philosophy, it is difficult to obtain. No agreed scale of values has ever been reached indeed. It is only in religion that we can find a basis, and the truth of religion Must be accepted by faith or invitation and not purely on the result of logical argument.” (Portion: Jurisprudences p.121).

In short secular intellect has totally failed to define good and bad. Hence there is no solution to the problem except that Man should seek guidance from God and follow the revealed doctrines. There is no other way of salvation for humanity. The Qur'an said:

أَفَمَنْ كَانَ عَلَىٰ بِلْدَنَاتِ مِنْ رَّبِّهِ كَمْنَ زَيْنَ لَهُ سُوْمَ عَمِيلَهِ، وَاتَّبَعُوا  
أَمْوَالَهُمْ

“Is he who has a clear proof from his Lord like those to whom their evil deeds are made alluring and they follow their caprices?” (Muhammad: 14)

Hence the only solution to the problem is that every new trend or custom and convention should be judged, not on its apparent shine and glitter but on the basis of standards laid down by Allah, the Lord of the Universe Once one finds any injunctions of Allah and His Messenger concerning it, then it must be followed without the least hesitation. The Qur'an says:

وَمَا كَانَ لِمُؤْمِنٍ أَنْ يَدْعُونَهُ إِذَا قَضَى اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ أَمْرًا، أَنْ  
تَكُونَ لَهُمُ الْخِيَرَةُ مِنْ أَمْرِهِمْ -

“And it is not for a believing man or a believing woman, when Allah and His Messenger have decreed a matter to have choice in their matter” (Q: 33:35)

Another verse of the Holy Quran speaks:

فَلَمَّا دَرَسَكَ لَهُ يُؤْمِنُونَ حَتَّىٰ يُحَكِّمُوكَ فِيمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ لَمْ  
يَعْجِدُوا فِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ حَرْجًا مِّنَ الْتَّقْضِيَاتِ وَيُسَلِّمُوا تَسْلِيمًا -

“But no, by your Lord, They will not believe until they make you (O Prophet) the judge of what is in dispute between them, then find no vexation in their hearts over what you decide and submit with full submission”. (Q:4:65)

Whatever injunctions Allah has revealed in His Book or through His Messenger (PBUH) pertain to such matters that if they are let to be decided by reason they have led to aberrance; and since Allah is well aware of all the past and future happenings only His commands can be obeyed in every time. Hence it is stated:

يُبَيِّنُ اللَّهُ تَكْفُرَ أَنْ تَضْلُّوا وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ شَيْئًا وَعَلِيمٌ -

“Allah makes clear (His commandments) to you, lest you go astray. And Allah is Knower of every thing.” (Q: 4:176)

This makes another thing about “Modernity” very clear that the need for Divine Revelations (Wahy) and commandments of Allah was felt because it was difficult to achieve true guidance in this matter through intellect alone. It is, therefore, essential that the Divine Injunctions be followed exactly as they are. It is a wrong practice that any prevalent custom of the time be first taken as correct on the basis of self-reasoning, and then attempts be made to fit the Qur'an and Traditions to it by making distant interpretations. Such a method cannot be called submission to the Will of Allah.

Rather it amounts to alteration and amendments for which no man is authorized, because that would annul the very purpose of sending Divine Guidance. True submission means that the commandments of Allah should never be allowed to be altered or modified even if the entire mankind collectively so desire. Allah says:

وَقَاتَلَتْ نَفِيَّتْ رَبِّكَ صَدُّقَأَ عَدْلَهُ لَا مُبَدِّلَ يَكْلَمُهُ، وَهُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْعَلِيمُ، وَإِنْ تَلْعَمْ أَكْثَرُ مَنْ فِي الْأَرْضِ فَيُغَلِّظُ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ، إِنْ يَتَبَيَّنُ عَنْ إِلَهِ الظُّنُونِ وَإِنْ هُمْ إِلَّا يَخْرُجُونَ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ مَنْ يَتَبَلَّغُ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ  
بِمَا هُنَّ يَدْعُونَ -

“And perfect are the words of your Lord in truthfulness and justice; there is none who can change His words; and He is the Hearer, the Knower. And if you (O Prophet) obey most of those on earth they would lead you astray from Allah’s way. They follow nothing but surmise, and they do but guess. Surely your Lord knows best who astrays from His way. And He knows best who are rightly guided.”

(Q: 6:115-117)

قَالَ الَّذِينَ لَا يَرْجِعُونَ إِنَّا أَنْتَ بِقُرْآنِنَا عَذِيرٌ هَذَا أَدْ  
بَدِّلْهُ وَقُلْ مَا يَأْكُلُنَّ لِي أَنْ أَبْدِلَهُ وَمَنْ يُنْقَلِّبِي نَفْسِيْ لِي  
أَتَقْسِمُ إِلَّا مَا يُؤْتَنِي إِلَيَّ -

“(And when Our clear revelations are recited to them) those who hope not for the meeting with Us say, “Bring a Qur’ān other than this or alter it. Say (O Prophet) “It is not for me to alter it of my own accord, I follow nothing, except what is revealed to me (Q: 10: 15).

This kind of true obedience may bring opposition of the people and one may face difficulties but those who stand this test of the time, are rightly guided in this world and the Hereafter. Allah says:

وَالَّذِينَ جَاهُدُوا فِينَا أَنَّهُمْ هُمُ شَبِيلُنَا، وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ لَكَمْ  
الْمُحْسِنِينَ -

“And those who strive in Our way, We shall certainly guide them in Our ways. Indeed Allah is with the good-doers.” (Q: 2:69)

It is not the way of a true Muslim that he accepts what he finds to fulfill his material desires and rejects what calls for some material loss or puts him through some trials. This attitude, in Qur’anic terms, leads one to lose both in this world and in the Hereafter.

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَنْ يَعْبُدُ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ حَرْوَنِ، فَإِنْ أَصَابَهُ خَيْرٌ  
يَأْمَانُهُ بِهِ، وَإِنْ أَصَابَهُ فُسْطَةٌ أَنْقَلَبَ عَلَىٰ وَجْهِهِ خَيْرَ  
الْدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ، ذَلِكَ هُوَ الْحَسْرَانُ الْمُسْبِّنُ -

“And among Mankind is he who worships Allah upon the very edge—so that if good befalls him he is contented with it, but if a trial befalls him he turns round on his face. He loses this world and the Hereafter. That is indeed a manifest loss.” (Q: 22:11)

The only way to judge between desirable and undesirable modernism is to examine it in the light of Qur’anic injunctions. If it is not in opposition to Allah’s Commandments it may be accepted otherwise it must be rejected without misinterpreting and distorting it even though it may be against the common trend of time. Reproaches and mockery coming from the people should not be allowed to change his firm belief. A true Muslim has a clear answer to such negative remarks provided by. the Qur’an:

أَلَّهُ يَسْهُلُ زِيَّرِهِ وَيَمْلُأُهُمْ فِي طُغْيَانِهِمْ بَعْثَرَاتٍ -

“Allah mocks at them and lets them loose in their impertinence in which they keep wandering.” (2:15)

This attitude is meant for such affairs of life as have been ordained to be Obligatory, Incumbent, Traditional, Desirable or Forbidden and Detestable. Hence these injunctions are unalterable in every period. However, for things that fall under the category of being “permissible” man has been authorized to adopt or to abandon them according to the needs and demands of time. In fact, there are

very few matters which Islamic Law has explicitly defined as Obligatory, Incumbent, Traditional, Desirable, Forbidden and Detestable, and are unalterable. On the contrary, most of the affairs of life fall under the category of “permissible” and decisions about their adoption or rejection can be made according to requirements.

We can see that the field of activity with regard to modernism as provided by Islam is very vast in which one can live a modern life without deviating from the way of Allah in the least. In them Man may apply his intellectual abilities and may achieve enormous heights of knowledge, discoveries as well as Science and Technology, and make them more and more useful for mankind.

The greatest challenge for the Islamic world today is to recognize these limits of “Modernity”, without interfering with the confined limits of unalterable injunctions of Islam. Unfortunately the present attitude of the Islamic world is in clear contrast to this. Our scholars have been markedly slow in the spheres which demanded their active efforts, while they are actively busy modernizing the unalterable Commandments of Allah with the consequence that Muslims are deprived of the amenities and comforts that modern time has provided to humanity and the evils of modernism are at liberty to prevail in our society with no check from our side. May Almighty Allah give us the ability and courage to fulfill our obligations to modern times while safeguarding our ideological heritage.

## CHAPTER 2

### ISLAM AND THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Life is constantly on the move. Every new era is associated with new circumstances and fresh problems. But the great revolution which the world has experienced after the invention of Machine, has affected every sphere of life. It has opened the doors of research and observation for every art and science, and has created some new problems in every section of life. If we look into the teachings of religions other than Islam we find that they are not capable of absorbing the great revolution in them. The fountainhead of these teachings was human intellect rather than the Divine Revelation (Wahy), hence they had neither a full cognition of human nature nor were they based on the considerations of changing circumstances of time, nor did they have an insight on the possible future happenings. The result is that most of the original teachings of those religions have died under the loads of machines. Now there exist only two possibilities before the followers of these religions. They have to say good bye to their religion if they want to keep pace with the march of time, and if their religion is dearer to them they have to turn away from the light of thought and cognition and make themselves an isolated group of people who do not belong to the twentieth century. However, some people have designed an intermediary way to reshape and modify their religion in order to make it practicable for the present time. But, obviously he is the follower of his own whims and not his true religion. In this case he is deprived of the religion he followed before. But the matter of Islam is totally different. This is the only religion in the world whose guidance is ever fresh. No revolutions and circumstances make it old. It is fresh today and it will remain fresh as long as the world exists. The reason is obvious. Its percepts and injunctions are not the product of the human brain which is unaware of the coming events. The source of its teachings is the Divine Revelations. The Being who made it the code of life for Mankind is the One who is the Creator of Mankind and the entire universe. He has full knowledge of Man's nature and his needs. He is fully aware of the changing circumstances and He knows what is going to happen when and where.

It is the miracle of His words that, the rules and regulations laid down by Him in the Qur'an and those preached by His last messenger Muhammad (PBUH) encircle all problems arising till the last day. The world may turn to one side or the other these teachings will continue to provide with. The principles and laws of Islam would always suffice for all times to come.

But it is a pity that a group of people in the Islamic world known as "Modernists" have been unable to get this reality. That is why, in taking their lead from other religions, they have started a campaign of alterations and innovations in Islam. They have made it their duty to prove that every exhibit of the industrial revolution is consistent with Islam. After every such alteration and innovation they present their only argument that Islamic Injunctions must change because the world has greatly changed after the industrial revolution bringing about revolutionary changes in thought and practice.

In this connection we wish to point out two types of changes that have occurred in every walk of life as a result of the industrial revolution of Europe. Some of them were inevitable for the present advancements and without them it was not possible for Science and Technology to have attained the present standard. It was due to these that the world had benefited by the latest inventions, large factories came into being, bridges have been constructed, big dams and useful additions to human knowledge have been made. This aspect of the industrial revolution is indeed commendable and it is imperative for the Islamic world to progress in this field. Islam does not place any obstacle in this direction. Rather, it looks at this achievement of power with approbation.

But, at the same time, there are some changes that are not at all essential for industrial and material progress. The West has associated them to industrial revolution for no reason, and now realizing this error is sighing with grief. Obscenity and nudity, free mixing of men and women, music and dances, interest and birth control are things that have nothing to do with material and industrial progress. Experience has proved that these things have served as an obstacle rather than assistance towards progress.

This is the evil from which the Islamic world has to save itself very diligently. Industrial revolution in the Islamic world has become a

necessity, but it should be a revolution free of the profanities of Western civilization which have led them to the brink of total destruction. Unfortunately, our modernist group wants us to accept the industrial revolution of the West as it is, without an iota of change in it, and thus drown ourselves in their ideological and practical aberrances even before the Machine has taken roots in our society. That is why, instead of developing Science and Technology, this group is spending its energy in molding Islam to bring it in conformity with Western civilization. Supporting this new viewpoint the official spokesman of monthly ‘Fikr-o-Nazar’ of the Institute of Islamic Research, writes as under:

“The entire life style of Pakistan will be changed after the completion of the fourth five-year plan. The rule of machine will prevail, and due to this family life will change, economy and social values will change, there will be changes in the relations between man and woman, and obviously, individual and collective thinking will be affected, and people will think more positively”. (Fikr-o-Nazar p.733, voL2, p.12)

It is obvious that such people do not want to make any distinction between the industrial revolution of the Islamic World and that of the West. Our humble submission is that the “rule of machine” in the industrial sphere is not negated, what we think highly venomous are the changes in the family life, economy and social values, relationship of man and woman and the thought of general people.

These “changes” do not match with the temperament of Islamic ideologies. A study of Industrial Revolution of the West itself leads us to think that we shall have to abstain from these “changes” if we want to lead a peaceful life despite the sway of machine in our lives.

The philosopher-poet of Pakistan, Iqbal, had a deep insight into the state of West, he said:

افنگ مشینوں کے دھوئیں سے ہے سی پوش

“Christianity (in Europe) is blackened with the smoke of machines”

And,

ہے دل کے لئے موت میشیں کی حکومت  
احساں مردوت کو کچل دیتے ہیں آلات

“The rule of machine is the death of soul. Instruments only crush the sense of tolerance.”

It will not be proper to deduce from the above that he was allergic to machines and instruments or that he opposed the progress of Technology. What he means is that the evil which the West has imposed on them along with the machines is detestable and should be avoided.

Under the present circumstances proper line of action for us is that in the pursuit of industrial revolution we should not blindly march on the path that has carried the West to the brink of total destruction. The industrial revolution will give rise to many difficulties and new problems, which will be resolved under the Islamic guidance and this solution, will be free from the defects of the Western thought. Rather, we should acquire science and technology with deep insight and open mind in a manner that Islamic values are not injured.

On the contrary, if alteration and innovation is carried out in Islam itself, to fit it into the framework of Western civilization and, somehow or the other, it is molded to meet the requirement of the modern time, what credit goes to Islam for this? In this manner any religion can be brought in conformity with the present time by twisting and distorting it. There are many who demonstrated such artistry in their religions. The credit of this goes to them and not to the poor religion that became a plaything in their hands. We honestly feel that Islam cannot be matched with other religions. Treating Islam in this manner is by no means justified, and any such attempt will be an interpolation in religion and hence condemnable.

No doubt many injunctions of Islam are flexible enough to accept changes in varying circumstances. But there are certain prescribed rules which must be observed when applying these to new problems. It does not mean that every Islamic injunction can be

dissolved in the ready-made mixture of modern necessities. It may be understood that the Islamic injunctions prescribed by the Qur'an, the Sunnah and by the consensus of the Ummah are fixed and unalterable. They cannot be changed in any period. However, in the matters, which can be influenced by change of time, the Holy Qur'an and Sunnah have provided us with some basic principles without giving specific commandment for a specific condition. These principles can be used as a basis for the deductions of new injunctions in every period. Had Islam permitted the people of every time to deduce Islamic injunctions according to their circumstances and in opposition to the unanimous decisions of the Muslim Ummah, it would not have provided us with such comprehensive and detailed commandments in every sphere of life. Rather, it would have said, "Keep making your own commandments according to your circumstances." On the contrary, Islam has provided us with specific and elaborate precepts with divine wisdom in order that they are to be observed up to the end of time. In short, these Islamic injunctions are fixed and cannot be changed simply because time has changed. They are not only practicable up to the Day of Judgment but they, in fact, hold the key to real material progress of the Muslims.

There are injunctions, the Qur'an and traditions have themselves left to be decided by time, which are alterable. They can be changed, and are being changed, according to the circumstances. But in the guise of this flexibility our modernists not only try to change those unanimously accepted injunctions that are being accepted as established for the last fourteen centuries but they desire to make amends even in certain beliefs that are against the clear and explicit injunctions of the Quran and Sunnah, though not accepted by a single person of any significance.

In case we allow this attitude to be correct it would imply that no basic belief of Islam has been understood by any one in the last fourteen hundred years. It requires our serious thought if such a religion is worthy of being followed by any sensible person? How funny it is that our modernists feel the change of time only when they want to give religious sanction to an activity or when they want to seek approval to a thought or practice of western ideology. On the contrary, when the change of time demands labor or some hard work they do not even think of it. For example, the modernists have made loud claims that usury and interest should be

made permissible because time has changed but none of them ever demanded that the concessions in the Salah (Five daily prayers of worship) and Fasting during journeys should be withdrawn because the change of time has made journey far more comfortable and easy than it was in olden days. They never insisted that these facilities should be withdrawn in modern time and they were meant only for the time foregone.

The hedonistic attitude of Modernism can be well conceived with this diversity of action. In fact all its arguments are designed for their pre-conceived ideas. Since their aim is to infuse Western ideologies in Islam they look for any situation where this may be achieved and they use, any trivial thing they find, as an argument, no matter how transient and superfluous it may be. Whereas the same argument is simply ignored when it turns against their intentions. How I wish that our Modernists think over these submissions seriously and realistically and their able efforts are spent on some constructive service instead of distorting or innovating the Islamic guidance.

## CHAPTER 3

### THE DEMANDS OF TIME

“Religious scholars (Ulema) should behave according to the demands of time”. This is a catchword we hear in a new style almost every day. Most of our secular minded leaders are repeating this suggestion off and on. And now we hear the echo of this suggestion even in our high level social gatherings whenever a religious subject comes under discussion. A group of people in our country is busy in surgical maneuvers on the explicit injunctions of Islam and its established principles under the guise of modernism. They regard religious scholars as the biggest obstacle in their path. They consider that their success depends on baseless accusations and malicious propaganda against religious scholars in whichever way it is possible. For this, they have adopted the ambiguous phrase “Demands of Time” as a hypnotizer for the modern minds, and make this a basis for their repeated appeals to the people and the government that religious scholars are the biggest obstacle in the way of progress and hence no heed should be paid to them and to what they say.

We leave them at the will of Allah from Whom no secrets of hearts are hidden. But there are some people who quite sincerely and seriously feel that religious scholars are unaware of the needs and demands of the modern age, and it is a result of this ignorance that they oppose every new thing. In these lines we wish to address this very group of people. But before this we humbly submit that if they are really well-wishers of Islam and Muslims they should give a cool thought to this matter and, for a little while, make free their minds from the grip of such hasty suggestions and try to understand what is meant by the “Demands of Time” and what is the best method of fulfilling it? With unbiased minds they should examine these allegations against the Ulema, the Islamic scholars.

The first thing to be defined is the phrase “Meeting the Demands of Time”? We feel that those who are so forcefully preaching the importance of demands of time themselves do not have a clear conception of these demands. They are simply making the ambiguous claims that religious scholars are opposed to the Demands of Time. But they never made it clear as to what those

specific demands are which are opposed by the Ulema. If by the "Demands of Time" they mean that Muslims should endeavor to equip themselves with all the means of science and technology without which it is not possible to survive as a free nation in the world of today then indeed this is the greatest need and demand of this time. For God's sake tell us who is the single scholar who forbids this most important demand of time? Which of these scholars, and when, has issued any verdict (Fatwa) that progress in the fields of science and technology is forbidden, unlawful, meaningless or useless? Science has made amazing progress in the recent years and it is in progress. Even in our life-time we have seen that newer inventions are coming up every day. How many of them have been opposed by the religious scholars? Electricity, Telegraphy, Telephone, Teleprinter, Wireless Radio, Transistors, Tape Recorders, Cars, Heavy Motor Vehicles, Aero planes, Steamers, Trains, Tanks, Mortars, Fighter Planes, Bombers, Submarines, Warships, Rockets, Missiles, Radar, Industrial Machines, Factories, Tractors, Chemical Fertilizers, Insecticides and Pesticides, Surgical Instruments, X-ray & other Radiological Machines are in use with religious sanction of Islam. All sources of knowledge in Arts, Science, Commerce, Mathematics, Geography, Geology, Astronomy, Civics, and Politics are some examples of material progress. Which of these has ever been opposed by religious scholars or any obstacles been placed in their way?

The history of the past twenty years of our developing country is a witness to the fact that by the Grace of Allah our country has advanced by leaps and bounds in material and economic progress perfectly corresponding to the wishes of our righteous religious scholars and religious circles. Many of the great economic schemes have been completed during this period, large factories have been erected, vast network of roadways constructed, numerous canals dug out for irrigation, many dams were made, the old communication system was replaced with new inventions, many colleges and universities for various sciences and arts came into existence and barren land was cultivated. Only an insane person can feel unhappy about these advancements. Once again I ask our modernists to point out just one religious scholar who ever opposed these achievements, or ever criticized production of expert scientists or educating people in engineering, or constructing roadways, factories, bridges, canals, river dams, using advanced technology in arms and ammunition for the country's defense, or

ever suggested that our army should not be trained in modern machine warfare, or that the latest telecommunication means should not be adopted, or education and training in modern arts and sciences should be stopped.

If none of the religious scholars has ever opposed it there can be no other interpretation of these baseless accusations except malice and enmity against the righteous scholars of Islam. We know, not one but countless such scholars whose hopes and trust are centered on Pakistan, and it is their greatest desire that side by side it marches on the straight path of Islam, Pakistan should progress by leaps and bounds in the material fields as well. That is why on the one hand they have been emphasizing on the Muslims that achievements of expertise of science and technology is an important component of our obligations, and if we fail to fulfill our obligations we shall be presented before Allah as an offender, and on the other hand they are praying day and night for the prosperity and integrity of Pakistan which is best known by Allah, the All-knowing, All-aware.

We are, however, presenting below the excerpts from the writings of some of those religious scholars who are being blamed of opposing science and technology.

In Pakistan the most renowned of the religious scholars was Moulana Shabbir Ahmad Usmani. His selfless sacrifices for the freedom of Pakistan can not be forgotten. In a conference at Dacca, in 1949, while explaining the policy of Pakistani scholars he declared in quite unequivocal terms:

“No matter what treatment we meet from those in authority, we shall leave no stone unturned to make this new country safe and strong for the pleasure of Allah and supremacy of Islam and believers of Islam” (Presidential address Jamiat Ulem'a-e-Islam Conference, Dacca 10 February, 1949)

Further in the same speech he said,

“We should not lag behind and show any laziness in the procurement of these material means and equipments to the last bit of our ability and competency, so that we may lower the morale of

our enemy and show our supremacy on them, because this is in accordance with the Qur'anic injunction.”

Continuing, he further said:

“In my opinion the secret of all our success and prosperity lies in the four words namely, Patience and Perseverance, Fear of Allah and Purity, Unity of nation, and Numerical strength to the possible limits. In short, we must keep our relations with Allah in the right direction in our individual and collective life, so that we deserve His favor and assistance. And I pray that the entire Muslim nation should unite together and bring forth the Power that would subdue all evil forces”.

The Grand Mufti of Pakistan, Mufti Muhammad Shafi, President, Darul Ulum, Karachi, has written in his treatise ‘Jihad’ as under,

“Indeed, the Patience, the fear of Allah and total belief in and submission to Allah is the real and unconquerable strength of Muslims. Along with it, however, it is also essential that equipment of war and ammunition proper to the time and place should be acquired and stored. The Prophet (SA) always arranged for war exercises, and issued instructions to collect and acquire all those weapons that were in vogue anywhere in those days. It has been reported by Ibn-e-Kathir in his book “Al- Hidayah wan Nihayah” under the caption of Battle of Hunayn that two of the Prophets’ companions could not take part in Jihad because they were in Damascus learning the techniques of manufacturing war weapons called ‘Dababa’ and ‘Dhabur’ (The carriages that were used as Tanks in those days). Similarly, catapults were also manufactured there.

“This incidence also proves that it is obligatory for the Muslims to make their countries self sufficient in war weapons and technology and should not depend on others. Otherwise the Prophet could have purchased those carriages and catapults rather than sending his men to learn the techniques to manufacture them by themselves. We are bound to think it seriously how much our country is in need of all the equipment and weapons of war used in modern warfare so that we may not be lagging behind. We must put all our energy and resources to fulfill the aim that we become self sufficient in the nearest possible future.” (‘Jihad’ pp.53 to 56)

In another of his books “Modern Weapons” the Grand Mufti has said:

“In short the industrial products and inventions, be they new or old, if related to mankind’s economic prosperity, are all benefactions of Allah that have been bestowed on human beings. Man should be wise enough to take full benefits from them and be grateful to Almighty Allah.” (‘Ala’t-e-Jadidah p.15).

And Moulana Zafar Ahmad Usmani, Sheikh-ul-Hadith, Darul-Ulum-al-Islamiya, Tando Allah Yar, writes in one of his recent articles:

“War weapons and technology against the enemy should be raised to the extent that the enemy is overawed with them. Our earlier Caliphs and Sultans religiously followed this rule. The companion Hadhrat Mu’awiyah (RA) had prepared a fleet of 500 warships during the time of Hadhrat Usman (RA), the third Caliph. He used to supervise personally the collection of all defense equipments and never depended on others as we do today. The Muslim nations should join together to build up factories for ammunition and other weapons, and a continued process of research and inventions must be carried out. All these efforts are in conformity with Qur’anic injunctions.” (Monthly Al-Balagh, p44 J.A 1387 (AH).

Moulana Muhammad Yusuf Binorri, Sheikh-ul-Hadith, Madrasah Arabiyah, New Town (Binnori Town), Karachi, writes:

“There is no scarcity in the Islamic world, rather there is an abundance of natural resources, material reserves and wealth, but how great a tragedy it is that a major portion of their wealth is utilized by the enemies through deposits in foreign banks, or spent in extravagance, debauchery, undue luxuries, and immoralities. But defense stability, military training and ordinance factories are practically negligible, while the enemies of Islam are constructing airports, naval fleets, military cantonments and large ordinance factories. But the Islamic world is not only indulged in profane pursuits but has shown criminal negligence towards material progress.” (Monthly B aiyyenat, Karachi, R.S. 1387 (AH), p.4)

Moulana Abdul Haq, Sheikh-ul-Hadith of Darul-ulum Haqqania, Akora Khattak, has elaborated the same view in one of his speeches:

“You have acquired only immorality and evil - doings from Europe. They manufacture one plane and innumerable rockets in a minute and collect billions of dollars to save the Jews, and we remain asleep in our luxuries. If we ignore our collective problems the result can not be other than destruction.” (Monthly Al-Haq, July 1967, p.17)

Moulana Shamsul Haq Afghani has written in one of his recent articles “Taraqqi aur Islam” (Islam and Progress):

“Our deprivation from progress and our present decline is the result of our neglect towards Islam, otherwise Islam and Progress are inseparable.... According to this verse it is obligatory on all Muslims that in all the modern equipments and instruments they should progress to the extent that they should be at least at par with Christian nations if not exceed them. The Islamic world must use all its resources for this purpose.” (Monthly ‘Al-Haq’, Sept 1967 p.22)

Above are the utterances of some high ranking and renowned religious scholars. These have come to our view just abruptly without any special efforts to find them. Those who had been reading the views of these scholars know it fully well that not only the religious scholars never opposed Science and Technology but they had always been inducing the Muslims to attain them. Despite this reality before their eyes there is a group of people who are beating their drums high and loud that the religious scholars are opposed to progress and advancement, they are allergic to Science and Technology, they give no importance to the demands of time, and discard every new thing.

The cleverest advocate of “Falsehood” was Goebbels, who spoke the Truth when he said that if “falsehood” is spread with full force the world starts taking it as the “truth”. Our modernists have also been following Goebbels’ adage so much so that even some of the very learned and balanced of mind people regard this slogan as true while it is just a false blame, cunningly produced by propaganda machines of modern time.

If, however, these people consider music and dance, nudity and obscenity, profligacy and immorality, co-education, free intermixing of men and women, usury in banking, and birth control as demands of time and means of progress, then indeed the religious scholars have openly opposed them, and they should have done so; they still do it and will continue doing it. We may be informed what logic and reason has ever claimed these things to be the demands of time? They must bring some logical argument to prove what relation material progress has with music and dances? Which is that progress that would stop without nudity and obscenity? What are the genuine obstacles in the way of promoting interest-free banking? How does co-education and free mixing of men and women help in science and technology?

The modernists may call music and dances, coeducation and mixed gatherings, etc. as the demands of time, but in view of the circumstances we sincerely believe that the greatest need and demand of the present time is that the Islamic world should totally eradicate these things with full might and power. This is because, the magnitude of the fatalities that has come to the forefront in the twentieth century was never witnessed before. The very Western intelligentsia itself is showing clear signs of extreme anxiety and restlessness on their premature but immoral and irrational social advancement. No literate person of the world can claim to be ignorant of this outcry that is echoing from the meeting chambers of Western thinkers as a result of social and moral ruin in their lives. The 'modernist' should, for God's sake, decide for himself as to what really are the demands of time? Should it be that the Islamic world should march on the footsteps of the West and fall into the same abyss of moral degradation? Or should the Islamic world take lesson from the dreadful end of the West and save itself from this dangerous path forever?

The group of people who consider these curses of Western civilization as demands of time and means of progress call themselves as "Modernists" but it is strange that in the field of thoughts and deeds they are preaching the same outdated ideologies of the West which have not given anything but burnt scars all over the body. They know very well how rapidly the Western style of thinking is changing about their old views, and what the latest studies of philosophy and science are proving about

these subjects? Take for example the problem of population. A very substantial number of modern economists are against limiting the family size and birth control. Having been impressed by their latest arguments such economists are constantly increasing in number, but our "Modernists" are still embracing Malthus' outdated theory that has been thrown away by the march of time some two centuries ago. I do wish to quote here the views of Philosopher-Poet, Iqbal, who said:

نے رقص و نمثran بے جا ب	وقتِ مغرب نہ از چنگ فرباب
نے زیر یاں ساقی دنے از قطع بکت	نے زکر سا حزان لامہ روست
محکمی اور لاش از لادینی است	محکمی اور لاش از خط لاطینی است
از ہمیں ہٹش پر اغش وشن است	وقت افرنگ از علم و فن است
حکمت از قلع و بردی جامہ نیست	مانع علم و بہر عس ام نیست

"Power of the West is not due to flutes and guitars, nor due to dances of veil less girls, nor due to the spell of their magical beauty, nor to their naked legs, nor to their trimmed hair styles. Their supremacy is not due to secularism, nor is their progress due to Latin script. Their power is due to science and technology. It is this fuel that is burning in their lamps. Wisdom does not lie in how your clothes are tailored, and the turban is no obstruction for science and technology".

The above is sufficient to show the nature of these accusations of our "Modernists" against the religious scholars of opposing the demands of time and Science and Technology? The question arises as to why the "Modernists" are so forcefully propagating this extremely unreasonable claim? As far as we can trace there is probably a psychological factor in action, if we rule out any specific motives behind it the fundamental error which misled these modernists is that they consider Islam analogous to Christianity and the Islamic world to the West. They had observed that at the time of revival of science and technology in the West the biggest obstacle was Christianity along with its scholars. As long as the supremacy of church prevailed in the West the whole region was filled with ignorance and illiteracy. The Christian scholars tried to suppress every such attempt that was made to create scientific awareness among the people. People like John Hiss and

Jerome were burnt alive in the city of Constance. The renowned scientist Galileo had to suffer calamities because he wanted to open new avenues in the field of science. But gradually the awareness spread and several movements came out. These tortures could not stop them, and ultimately Martin Luther, John Calone and Zongli put up a struggle that defeated Papalism and these movements got their chance to flourish. Lately Russo, Horonic and Reman with other modernists made further changes and innovations in the religion and brought it in conformity to the scientific researches of that time. The situation now is that Luther, Calone, Russo and Horonic etc. have been titled as Reformers by the religious minded people of the West. They are regarded as national heroes and people of the new generation, who have not yet become totally alien to religion, regard them with a sense of honor and dignity that by making fundamental changes in Christianity they freed the nation from the grip of Papalism which was the greatest obstacle in the way of their material progress.

Now, the modernists of Islam want to make similar amendments by considering Islam equal to Christianity and scholars of Islam parallel to popes and regard themselves as Luthers and Russos of their time. In this way they want to become the Reformers of the Muslim nation by opposing and defaming the religious scholars. They aspire that some Henry VIII will soon appear and he will grace them by accepting their ideology and then officially implementing it for ever. Thus the coming generations will regard them in such high esteem as is the case of hero-worship with Luther and Russo etc.

We may remark here that they are in great delusion and their dream is never going to come true. They are badly mistaken in considering Islam similar to Christianity and scholars of Islam to popes. The unnatural views of Christian religion which became common after the third century did not have adequate power to keep pace with

time for all future days to come, and stand face to face with the latest scientific advancements. That was an era of dark ignorance and superstitions which could not stay in the light of knowledge. Hence science came as a great challenge and they were left with no other option than either to oppose science openly or by cutting and dipping their religion to bring it in conformity with the scientific knowledge. The popes initially adopted the first course and declared science as the forbidden tree. But Science was the real

need of that time and they could not stop its progress merely by a hollow claim and baseless charges against it. The result was that all their efforts failed to stop scientific advancement.

At this stage the modernists adopted the second course and started manipulating the religion and distorting its teachings so that people may not mock and laugh at it. This was indeed a service to Christianity, and if they had not done this favor Christianity would have been swept away by the torrent of Rationalism and no trace of it could be found today. The workmanship of Christian modernists helped the Christian religion to survive although its fundamental concepts were totally changed. At least its name and external structure still exists. It is this favor of the modernists to Christianity that made them heroes of their nation and due to this the major part of the Christian world holds them in high esteem.

But the case of Islam is totally different. It is a natural religion and it has come to exist till the Last Day. By virtue of its old and real interpretations it has the capability of marching forward with the researches of every era. Hence science has never been a danger to it nor will it ever be. Rather, we have observed that the latest inventions and researches of science generally make its beliefs and teachings more transparent. Hence it has no need to oppose science and its progress nor to change its own concepts. That is why unlike the popes the religious scholars of Islam never opposed science, because they know the realities exposed by Islam will become more and more transparent with the advancement of science. Since the Muslim Ummah believes that Islam is the religion revealed by Allah it does not have to change at any time, and that is why this nation has always condemned and disregarded any attempts towards making any changes in its teachings.

To sum up, Islam is neither a spiritless religion like Christianity to have any fear or danger from scientific and technological advancement, nor its religious scholars (Ulema) have ever opposed science and technology as the Popes had done, neither does it need any Martin Luther, Russo or Renan for its survival. That is why, in the history of this religion, all those who tried to amend, manipulate or modernize it, got nothing but reproach and condemnation. In the history of this religion, the advocates of modernism have not been called Luther and Kalone, but the modernists of our history are remembered by the names of

Musailmah, Abdullah bin Saba, Abu Musa Mazdar, Hasan bin Sabbah, Qaramat, Abul Fazl, Faizi and Kamal Ata-Turk. Even their children would feel ashamed of their lineage with these names. The opponents of Luther and Kalone are mentioned with great disregard by the Christians. But the opponents of modernism in Islam, namely Abu Bakr Sidiq (RA), Ali bin Abi Talib (RA), Ahmad bin Hambal (RhA), Mahmoud Ghaznawi (RhA) and Mujaddid Alf Thani (RhA) are still living with their names, and as long as the human conscience is alive the names of these sacred personalities will continue to be taken with love and allegiance. It is a pity that our present day modernists have not been able to understand the great diversity between Islam and Christianity, and as a result of this grave misunderstanding they have been busy in abusing the scholars of Islam, calling them obscurantist, accusing them of ignorance for no reason. We earnestly request them with all the well-wishes and heart-felt sympathies that they revise their attitude with a cool mind and balanced thoughts, otherwise the course adopted by them is in no way beneficial for Muslims, for the country and the Ummah and even for themselves.

I hope and pray that my humble submissions leave a useful impression on them.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESEARCH OR DISTORTION?

This article was originally addressed to “Institute of Islamic Research” which was headed by Dr. Fazlur Rahman at that time, but applies to all modernists of our time.

Indeed numerous judicial problems have been created in our time, and in order to solve them it is essential that scholars of Islamic jurisprudence and those having insight in these matters make collective efforts through regular discussions, debates and research. There are many such problems facing the Muslim world which require that the scholars of Islam and experts of modern science hold joint discussions to solve them in the light of established principles of Islam. The importance and necessity of this splendid job is being felt in various circles of Islamic scholars and some efforts are also being made at some places but due to lack of resources these efforts have so far not materialized into an organized collective forum.

The present government has formed an institute for this purpose after it came into power. Section 107 of our Constitution describes the purpose of such a body that through its research on various religious problems be carried out on the one hand, and on the other hand the society may be reformed on “True Islamic fundamental values”. The president of Pakistan, Field Marshal Muhammad Ayub Khan, has written in his autobiography that he had constituted an Advisory Council of Islamic Ideology and an Islamic Research Institute to advise the Government on our legislative problems, after studying them in the light of religion. He stated that this would help the legislators in bringing our laws in harmony with the spirit of Islam. But for the practicability of these laws, “a thorough survey of the requirements of the society is needed.” (Friends Not Masters, page 106). Nobody can deny the importance and commendability of purpose described here. In fact, this reflected the wishes of scholars of Islam and every one having an Islamic mind. Without such a move it is impossible to change and mould the worn out system of the country’s judiciary into Islamic laws.

But any institution, no matter how sincere be the intentions behind it and how useful be the purposes of its establishment, can not give beneficial results unless its system of operation is right and its authorities are competent to deal with its problems without bias and prejudice. They must have a reasonable working plan in their minds and the way to achieve them must be just and straight. Unless these conditions are fulfilled no institution can be expected to be successful.

This is why the “Institute of Islamic Research” has not been able to justify its establishment so far. Several years have passed since this institution was formed but so far it has not only been unable to do some useful work but in fact an atmosphere of discord and dissension has been created in the country. So far it has created problems rather than solving them, evolved difficulties for our social structure rather than removing them, given air to the glowing fire rather than extinguishing it. That is why the institution which should have been the centre of wishes and ambitions of the nation, could not gain the confidence of the people. Living in the world of vain imaginations is living in a fools paradise. Try to penetrate the feelings of more than a hundred million population of Pakistan and your conscience will tell you that they do not consider this institution as their own. The so-called achievements of this Institute pinches in their hearts like thorny bushes, and their lack of confidence is so extreme that even a rightful statement from this institution is looked with doubt and suspicion.

In these lines we would like to discuss the reasons which have turned an extremely useful institution into an extremely harmful and unsuccessful one, and due to which a very unhealthy atmosphere of disruption, disputes and disturbances has been created.

This is not a matter of obstinacy or anybody's personal prejudice rather it concerns a problem on which depends the survival of Islamic thought and Islamic way of life, if it is not solved with solemnity and balanced thinking, this nation will never be able to achieve the goal that led to the creation of Pakistan. Hence the exigency of time demands that all concerned should think and ponder over this problem with a cool temperament disregarding sentimental pressures.

In our view the main cause of failure of this institution is that the people in authority could not differentiate between “Research” and

“Distortion”. They have taken the two words as analogous and thus found superfluous solutions to the problems not conforming to the ideology of Islam at all.

It was obligatory for the Islamic researchers of our time to acquire and explore the guidelines of Islam provided regarding the problems being faced by Mankind in the twentieth century. How can it be put into practice? How the practical difficulties in this way can be removed? It was their duty to have surveyed the Western civilization with a view of research and criticism rather than counterfeiting them. They should have discarded the things that clashed with the laws of Islam, and should have suggested alternate ways which conformed to Islamic laws and at the same time fulfilled the legitimate needs of time.

But the line of action of researchers of the Institute of Islamic Research is quite in contradiction to this. On the one hand they presupposed that the thirteen hundred years old laws of Islam have now become worn out and outdated, and it is not possible to implement and comply with them unless some fundamental changes are made in them (They call these changes as “New interpretations”). And on the other hand it has rooted deep into their minds that ideological and practical expositions of Western civilization are all blessings and benedictions, and unless Muslims accept them in Toto their survival in the present time is impossible.

The entire intellectual structure of Modernism has been constructed on the above two hypotheses. As a result, the style of their working had been that any ideology or style of working from the West is first taken as granted to be cent per cent right and there is no way out for us in the present time than to accept it and adopt it. Their ‘Research’ is then wholly directed towards proving it to be in conformity with Islam, by reshaping and distorting Islamic teachings and even by changing the established commandments of Islam. They do not hesitate in denying the prophetic traditions, or write down a new dictionary to give new meanings to the verses of the Qur'an.

This is the very style for which the word “Distortion” should be used in place of “Research”. Our submission is that, if you believe that Islam is the natural religion, if you have faith that its principles and injunctions are not the product of any human brain but that of

the All-knower Allah who is fully aware of all the needs of Mankind for all times to come, if you are confident that the Islam proclaimed by Muhammad (PBUH) contains satisfactory solutions to all the problems and difficulties that may arise till the Last Day, then you must admit that the solution to the problems of twentieth century also lies in the same principles which were brought by the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) 1400 years ago. This is, however, subject to the condition that you sincerely try to get rid of the inferiority complex which has made the West as the standard of righteousness in your eyes. Once you get the courage to lift up the veil of deception of the West from your mind you will have the chance to understand the problems with full confidence. It is then that you will discover new ways of survival in the present time fulfilling all the needs and demands of time on the one hand and save you from the unholy ways of the West. If you follow this course you will be able to acquire the wealth of peace and tranquility that has never been imagined by the West.

We may be excused if you find our tone unmannerly but if you have any claim to realism, be realistic in analyzing your approach. While seeking the solution to your problems you have the fear of being called conservative or superstitious or uncivilized by the West. This complex does not allow you to give a serious thought to the true Islamic virtues. You are always anxious to give Islamic sanction to all those things that have a label of liberalism on them. May be that this line of action brings you some good name in the Western circles, but this is never going to solve your problems nor will it give you the status of a living and free nation. It is not sensible.

We may seem to exaggerate about your mode of action but an honest and realistic self-analysis will testify to the truth of our claim.

You have observed that the West has based its entire banking system on "Interest". This is the system which is regarded as one of the prominent virtues of modern civilization. So, you started investing all your energy to make the interest permissible in trading system. You never bothered to ask yourself if the interest was really inevitable for the Banking system and why cannot this be run on the Principles of 'Mudaribah' provided by Islam and why the Islamic Principle of 'Mudaribah' cannot be adopted in Banking? At

the cost of the opposition of the Muslim Ummah you have compound interests but you never cared to find out the principles of interest-free banking which assures us more equitable distribution of wealth.

The “Insurance” is regarded as a symbol of civilization in the West. You accepted it as it was and tried to give it Islamic sanction by making fabricated interpretations in the Qur'an and Sunnah. But you never knew that there was an easier and fairer way of making some minor changes in the prevailing insurance system and thus bring them in conformity with the established principles of Islam, making it a more useful institution.

The Western countries have recently launched great campaigns to preach “Family Planning”. You also followed them in propagating it. For this purpose you consumed your energies to misinterpret the laws of Islam in favor of family planning. But you never thought how China is surviving with its 700,000,000 population? According to Chu-en-lai every new child brings a message of prosperity. In the hue and cry of the Western world you looked at one mouth of a newly born child and felt uneasy to think from where to feed it? But you did not see the two hands of the child to work. The small country like Israel realized the importance of population and has been using all the means of increasing its population. The Westerner had said that population rise is dangerous for developing countries. You accepted this “sincere advice” and imposed birth control as a law, but you failed to see how Vietnam had humbled the big power like America and why the Western countries are scared of China? Americans had declared that in the East they would give financial aid only to those countries who would adopt the birth control. You took it as a sympathetic gesture from them but you did not try to argue why Israel gets the lion's share in aid inspite of being against birth control?

You heard that polygamy is considered to be a crime in Western countries. In order to free yourself from this blame you made the excuse that Islam had allowed it only in some emergency conditions and now it is no more permissible. For this purpose you left no stone unturned in pulling and dragging the meanings of the verses of Holy Qur'an. But did you ever try to investigate why the Westerners never feel the need of more than one wife? Thanks to

Modern Civilization and the open practice of un-registered polygamy in every hotel, every night club and every park, there is no need of getting oneself involved in regular family life. The Westerners had publicized that polygamists are cruel to their wives. You started pleading that the fundamental conception of Islam is to stop such a tyranny and hence polygamy is forbidden in Islam. But you shut your eyes from the naked reality that there are innumerable people who are extremely cruel to their single wife. In fact the number of such people is greater. Hence this argument requires that single marriage also should be banned.

You observed that the Westerners consider Hijab (woman's veil) as a vice, so you started fabricating the established injunctions of Islam. But you never cared to think that by unveiling their women what disaster the West has brought, to their homes? Did you ever care to know, what is the cause of unabated grief of the serious thinkers of the West on this issue?

You came to know that co-education is practiced in Western countries. You started advocating for it as an insignia of civilization, but never bothered to think of the reasons behind the dreadful scene of American culture presented by Kinsey Reports before the world? Did you ever think who is responsible for the ever increasing unlawful sexual relations in the young generation? What is the cause of the ever decreasing standard of education?

You have read that many of the Westerners deny miracles and hold them as superstition. Very obediently you also followed the example and tried to reject the miracles described by the Qur'an in detail. As a result of this you converted the entire Qur'an into a poetic and metaphorical book. But you never thought that those who had initially denied the miracles had also called the existence of God as the worst form of superstition. They had even mocked at Prophethood and Divine Revelations.

Further, you never paid any attention to the fact how rapidly the most recent researches of scientific knowledge are making miracles more acceptable to human intellect.

Keeping all these facts in view, for God's sake, please tell us if there is any exaggeration in our assessment that you pay no heed to finding an Islamic and intellectual solution to these problems. On

the contrary you are always looking for the Western ideologies. Whatever you receive from them as permissible you spend all your energy to prove it in conformity with Islam, with no concern to what damage you are causing to the Qur'an and Sunnah. When you notice any signs of dislike for something on the faces of Westerners you exhaust all your powers to declare it unlawful and prohibited in Islam even at the cost of giving away explicit injunctions of the Qur'an and Sunnah.

Further, it is noteworthy that so far you have taken into consideration only those problems which have been raised by the Westerners. You paid no heed to the multitude of genuine problems of our own society, and no attempt was made to solve these problems. A clear example of this is: You promptly noticed the injustice which the polygamist do to their wives even though such incidences are rare in our society, while the brutalities done by the monogamists are so common that hardly any family is devoid of it. You will find innumerable women who do not have co-wives yet they are leading a miserable life due to inequity of their husbands. The plight of such women does not stir your heart; you feel no sympathy for their helplessness and make no attempt to free them from the cruel grip of their cruel husbands?

Your pen did not move for a single word against the evil customs of our society with reference to marriages, dowry, Mehr, living allowances, housing and inter family relations. You made no move against the defective, time-consuming and out-dated judiciary system, which has deprived the society of justice. In matrimonial matters you could see only one thing, that is, polygamy which is practiced hardly by 10% of people, and you consumed all your efforts in proving it as unlawful. The reason of your serious concern against polygamy is that it was initiated from the West and hence it sounded most important to you, while other problems being local, could not achieve your serious consideration.

Moreover, the problems that came to your attention, you tried to solve them by a strange method. Inspite of investigating into the real causes of the problems you just took the easy way of finding temporary and easygoing solutions.

Due to ignorance from the teachings of Islam the common people have developed a practice of throwing three divorces to their wives

on trivial matters. This practice is absolutely wrong and impermissible which is usually the cause of social disorder. It was essential that a wide publicity was made to educate people on gravity of this sin and its evil consequences. It was further necessary to decide if any legal punishment for such a sin can be imposed or not? Surprisingly, you brought out the solution to this problem that makes a mockery of the entire judicial system of Islam. Your solution was that "three" should be counted as one, thus giving free license to men to give as many divorces as they could without being acknowledged as three. Is it not like a person being beaten by another, when the oppressed man calls you for help you tell him "Keep taking the punishment, we shall never accept that you had been beaten". Is this the way of freeing the oppressed from oppression?

You observed that sometimes an orphan grandson is left unprotected after the death of his paternal grandfather. Your solution to the problem is to cut a portion of legacy of his paternal uncles and give it to him. But you failed to conceive that if it be set into practice how would you solve the problem of orphan nephews? Why should they be deprived of a share in the heritage of their uncles? You also ignored the basic moral obligation that you cannot remove the distress of one person in the Robin Hood fashion. For removing the distress of such helpless persons Islamic Law provides adequate relief. These methods are explained in "Kitab-un-Nafqat", "Kitab-ul-Wasiyyah" and "Kitab-uz-Zakah". If the rules laid down in them are implemented properly they would be of great help to the distressed.

The above observations if given due consideration, with no prejudices in mind, provide one with the conclusion that the Institute of Islamic Research and its co-workers are basically wrong in their very mode of thinking. As a result of it they have not only been unable to do any service to the country and the nation but in fact created disruption, uneasiness, confusion and anxiety throughout the country. How we wish that the authorities of this extremely important institute give serious, sincere and selfless thought as to how harmful and dangerous for national unity is the way adopted by them?

We have not made these submissions for supporting any group, but it is a sincere and devoted effort to incite them on giving a serious and sincere consideration to our deliberations.

## CHAPTER 5

### NEW INTERPRETATION OF ISLAM

In the previous article we had exposed one aspect of the modernistic school of thought that they have made the Western way of thinking and living a criterion of right and wrong. In this article we are making some further submissions about the way of thinking and the method of argumentation of the modernists which are of fundamental importance to the subject under discussion. We intend to point out the reasons why all the efforts of our modern researchers have led them to the path of distortion in the name of “research”.

Even a man with ordinary common sense knows that “Research” means “Search for Reality” and a researcher holds the position of a judge. It is his obligation that without forming any preconceived ideas and pre-drawn conclusions he should examine all the relevant matters thoroughly and impartially, consider all possible aspects of the problem with utmost honesty and add the weight of his judgment to the right side of the argument. On the contrary, if any one seeks and searches the arguments to support a preconceived idea or judgment he is certainly not the seeker of truth, nor do his efforts in this direction deserve to be called ‘research work’.

The duty of a research worker is not to collect arguments for a predetermined idea but to determine an idea in the light of arguments. He does not drag the arguments towards his judgment but the arguments drive him towards a judgment. But the process of working of our modernists is quite opposite. They believe that arguments are to serve a decision rather than the decision being dependent on arguments. This is what they think is the correct method of research and this what they teach as a methodology of research. They commonly make suggestions in their oral and written statements that:

“We want to interpret the Qur'an and the Sunnah in a manner that it conforms to the needs of our time”.

It is a clear admission to the fact that they want to bring the Qur'an and Sunnah to reconcile with their decisions and not make their

decisions to correspond with the Qur'an and the Sunnah. That is they will first decide as to what are the needs of time and then to try and find these arguments they will make such interpretations of the Qur'anic verses and prophetic traditions as to conform to their predetermined needs of the Time. This is what is termed as the "distortion of meaning". This way of argumentation can never be supported by any sensible person of the world. If the process of research is allowed to move in reverse direction then there will be no way left to protect the integrity of the truth. This is because in this way every illogical claim can be supported by argument. Nothing in the world would then be devoid of argument, and as they say: "Everything can be proved by everything". Once it is decided that a certain thing is to be proved through the Qur'an and Sunnah, and for this purpose you have decided to give new interpretation to the Qur'an and Sunnah, it would obviously mean that anything found supporting this idea would be presented as an argument no matter how weak and baseless it be and even the strongest argument against it would be thrown away being incompatible with present day life.

You probably know that the Christian missionaries, while preaching their religion in the Muslim world, always prove their beliefs through the Qur'an and Traditions before common Muslims. For example, they say that the Qur'an has called Jesus, as "Kalimatullah" (The word of Allah) which implies that he was Allah's attribute of "Kal'am" (Speech) and the Bible of John also says the same. Also, the Qur'an said that Jesus was "R'uhullah" (The spirit of God) which implies that his relation with God was the same as that of Soul with body, and the same is said by Paul. They further say that the Qur'an said: "We supported Jesus with the holy spirit" and the same has been mentioned in the Bible that the Holy Ghost was sent to Jesus in the form of a pigeon.

In this way they prove their concept of Trinity, and the tragedy is that they prove it through the Qur'an by virtue of its "new interpretation". As for the verses of the Qur'an which explicitly condemn the concept of Trinity, their "new interpretation" is that these verses condemn Trinity in the literal and real sense of the word, and even the Christians accept that there is only one God, and these three are only the components of one and not separate gods. Also according to their "new Interpretation" of Qur'an and its proclamation "Those who say Jesus son of Mary is god are Kafirs (unbelievers)" in fact meant to contradict the sect of

monophacy. Where Qur'an has warned the Christians against the torment of Hell their "new Interpretation" is that this does not refer to Catholics but is meant for monophasics. The Qur'an says that Jesus was not crucified. The "new Interpretation" is that, Christians in general also believe that the third person of Trinity was not crucified and the Qur'an does not contradict the crucifixion of his body."

It can be seen how the magic of "new Interpretation" proved all Christians' beliefs to be in conformity with Islam. The question arises "What is the difference between your new Interpretation and that of the Christians?" If you have a right to make "new Interpretation" of the Quran and Sunnah in order to amend the established laws of Islam why the Christians should not have the same right? Under what rule or regulation can you reject the Christians' "new Interpretation"?

One may argue that our comparison of "new Interpretation" of modernists with the "new Interpretation" of Christians is exaggerated, but that is not true. The readers may go through their articles on the subject and the truth of our statement will become quite apparent.

We come across numerous interesting "new Interpretations" in the book named "Islam" written by the Director of Islamic Research, Dr. Fazlur Rehman. According to him only three daily Salah were originally made obligatory, and two more were added in the last years of the Prophet's life. Hence their number has the possibility of accepting changes.

"Anyhow, the fact that basically there were three daily Salah is also supported by the incidence that there is one narration according to which Prophet (PBUH) has converted the four Salah into two". Anyway it happened in the post-prophetic era that the number of Salah without any alternative choice, was strictly fixed as five. In this way the fact that the number was basically three got swept away in the flood of traditions reported in support of the number of five". (Monthly "Fikr-o-Nazar, vol: 5, p.259)

This is the "new Interpretation". According to this, on one side "the flood of authentic prophetic traditions" which described the number of Salah as five from the very beginning of Islam is false

and self-invented; on the other side the single narration describing the incidence of “combining the two Salah” has been considered by them as most reliable. Then again the term “combining two Salah” has been taken to mean that the Prophet had converted four into two. This is the most interesting example of the expertise in the “new Interpretation”. If you have read this narration you will definitely enjoy the fallacies of thought.’ This is the way of argument about which somebody has said,” You can prove everything by everything.”

This is just one example that we have presented. If you go through the exegeses of these modernists you will come across many “master pieces” of their “new Interpretations”; Wahy (Divine revelations) is interpreted as the Prophet’s own words; Angels mean water, electricity etc.; Iblis (Satan) as the fantasy; Jinns as the savage tribes; mankind as the civilized people; Death is unconsciousness, disgrace or disbelief; life means honor and dignity, state of consciousness or embracing Islam etc.

If you keep the above exegetic points in view you will know that we have not exaggerated at all. Anyway, this was just a parenthesis. We wanted to impress that if we adopt the style of making arguments dependent on preconceived thoughts even Christianity can be proved from the Qur'an itself, and so can be Judaism, Socialism and Capitalism. Adopting the same style Dr. Pervaiz has proved Darwin's theory of evolution in his book ‘Iblis aur ‘Adam’ from the Qur'an. Also he has derived an economic system of socialist style from the Qur'anic phrase (Establish your prayers of worship). It is the same style of interpretations by which Mirza Ghulam Ahmad Qadyani had pleaded that by Damishk (Damascus) the Prophet had meant Qadiy'an, the Mirza's headquarters.

Thus we see that the system of modernists is that they first fix some ideas themselves, label them as the exigencies of time and then impose the Qur'an and Hadith through their “new Interpretation” on them. This is the very first brick the angulations of which has resulted in the crookedness of the entire structure of their views and thoughts, and this is the fundamental reason why their thoughts have entered the limits of ‘distortion’ overthrowing all principles, rules and regulations of research and knowledge.

There are some rules and regulations for research in every art and science. You cannot reach the correct conclusion unless you follow them. In the present jurisprudence also “Interpretation of statutes” is a compulsory subject. It has definite rules and regulations and unless they are given due consideration no interpretation by any legal expert can be acceptable.

In the same manner, rather more reasonable and well organized, are the detailed rules and regulations for “Interpretation of Qur'an and Sunnah and Islamic law” that have been compiled after thorough research, devoted attention and minute observations. Hundreds of books are available on the subject and each rule has been thoroughly screened. Unless the Qur'an and Hadith are interpreted within the framework of these rules and regulations no reasonable person can accept them, exactly as such explanations of present commentators cannot be accepted that do not conform to the principles of “Interpretation of statutes”.

But our modernists do not bind themselves to any such rules in their interpretations and commentaries due to their stamped way of thinking. Thus they frequently defy the established rules of interpretation of the Qur'an and Sunnah. For example, the established rule of Islamic Jurisprudence is that proverbial or allegoric meaning of any word or phrase of the Qur'an or Hadith would be adopted only when literal meaning is either impossible or have become obsolete in common use. This is perfectly a reasonable rule which can not be challenged through any intellectual argument, without it no definite conclusion can ever be derived from anything said by anybody. But this rule is profusely ignored by the modernists in their writings. Wherever they find a word in the Qur'an and Hadith, clashing with their concepts, they unhesitatingly give it an allegoric and sometimes purely imaginative interpretation. “Son” has been interpreted as “grandson”; staff turned into “argument”; death as a state of “coma or disgrace”, “Satan” as “fantasy or illusion “so much so that “Allah and Messenger” have been termed as “centre of the Ummah”. These are just a few examples. If these absurdities are all compiled together a voluminous book can be prepared.

It can be said by the modernists that they do not agree with the rules and regulations fixed by the Islamic jurists and that is why they do not follow them. In that case they should have pointed out

those rules and given some alternate principles better than the rules of the jurists. Then they should have used their formulated rules in their writings.

But we find that their interpretations are not supported by any principle at all. At one occasion they break a rule and oppose it, but at another occasion they derive their argument for their new interpretation. They reject any tradition that appears to contradict their views, no matter how authentic a chain of reporters it has, but where a tradition appears to support their views, they ignore the clear verses of the Holy Qur'an on the basis of a tradition which is weak and without support of authentic narrators. A recent example is the statement of Dr. Fazlur Rehman in which he has said that the meat of an animal is lawful and permissible to eat even if it is slaughtered without the name of Allah pronounced on it, while the explicit injunction of Qur'an is this:

وَلَا تَأْكُلُ مِنَ الْأَمْوَالِ مِمَّا لَمْ يُذَكَّرْ إِنَّمَا سُمِّيَ اللَّهُ عَزَّلَهُ

(And eat not that (flesh) over which Allah's name has not been pronounced.)

But since this was against the views of Dr. Fazlur Rehman, he based his arguments on a narration of Hadhrat Aishah and on a saying of Imam Shafi which is perhaps the weakest argument of all his juristic inferences (as has been admitted by the scholars of Shafi school of thought), while his own view about the application of a tradition is as follows:

"If a tradition tells anything that is not in conformity with the apparent Qur'anic injunction I would attribute it to the specific historical era rather than to the Prophet himself". (Monthly "Fikr-o-Nazar, p.5 15, vol.2)

Apart from the fact that his inference from Hadhrat Aishah's narration is highly misleading, Dr. Fazlur Rehman should not seek argument from this according to his own principle cited above. On what ground has he attributed this tradition to the Holy Prophet (PBUH)?

A far as Imam Shafi is concerned, the Doctor has commented about him as under:

“The enlightened views and quick understanding of Imam Sh’afi did create a mechanic system which undoubtedly led to stabilization of social and religious structure of our mediaeval era, but due to it we have been deprived of modern thinking and creative intellect. (Monthly “Fikr-o-Nazar”, p.30, vol.1)

If Imam Sh’afi had committed such a fundamental error how can you quote him as authority on the validity of a religious precept? Does it not become apparent from the above examples that Dr. Fazlur Rehman and his coworkers have no set criterion for research in their mind. Not only that they have not taken into consideration any of the established rules of Jurisprudence, they do not even follow the rules framed by themselves?

There can be no other reason for this betrayal of their own principles that first they form their own views and then seek arguments to support them. Obviously this method cannot go along with rules and regulations, because with every new idea they have to frame new regulations. If they are requested in the name of God to let alone the “knowledge: and research” and refrain from making the Quran and Sunnah a plaything as was done by the Jews and Christians in case of Torah and Injil, such persons are instantly labeled as “Obscurantists” and “Ignorant of the exigencies of time”. Their judgment about them is that they are blind, to the new environment and have no knowledge of the modern demands. (Monthly “Fikr-o-’ Nazar”, p.731, vol.2)

We are conscious that in response to our sincere submissions, we shall also be rewarded with such titles but we are writing and will continue to write the truth hoping that there may be a heart in search of truth that may accept it. Maybe our suggestions can awaken a sleeping conscience.

## CHAPTER 6

### SCHOLARS OF ISLAM AND PAPACY

Who should be competent to interpret and explain the Quran and Sunnah (Prophetic traditions) and to deduce various injunctions for problems arising in new circumstances? What are the conditions and requirements necessary for this job? We find the answers to these questions in an authentic Tradition reported by Hadhrat Ali in which he said:

I said, “O messenger of Allah! If we are confronted with a problem which has not been described in the Qur'an and Prophetic traditions, with no injunctions in favor or against it, what am I to do in such a situation?” He said: “Take advice of the jurists and faithful worshippers and do not employ your individual opinion”.

The Holy Prophet (PBUH) has explicitly stated in this narration that two conditions must be fulfilled by a person who wants to deduce laws and injunctions from the Qur'an and Prophetic traditions. Firstly; he must be a jurist and secondly, he must be a devotee to worship. The importance of the first condition is obvious because objectives of the Qur'an and traditions can be well conceived only by those who possess vast and deep knowledge, who are fully aware of the rules laid down by the earlier jurists and who have spent their lives in understanding the intentions of divine laws. Similarly, the Prophet has made it a condition for him to be a devotee and faithful, that is, he must have devoted himself to the practices of these laws. Anyone who can not make distinction between permissible and forbidden in practical life and whose every day practices are in contrast of these laws can not comprehend the intentions of Islam. Deduction of the laws is, in fact, the “Search for the Truth”, and the Qur'an states that Allah bestows the faculty of cognizance of the truth to the one who confides in it in his practical life. It is said:

إِنَّمَا يَنْهَا اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ فَمَنْ يُنْهَىٰ

(If you fear Allah He will give you the power of discrimination between truth and falsehood). (8:29)

This verse has clearly stated that “Fear of Allah” is the primary condition for a sense of discrimination between right and wrong. It is quite obvious from the above verse of the Qur'an and the Prophetic tradition that a religious and juristic solution can best be found by a person who is a “jurist” and a “devotee” (or “Muttaqi”, that is, the one who abstains from evil for fear of Allah).

Lately Mufti Muhammad Shafi, Grand Mufti of Pakistan and President, Darul-Ulum, Karachi had summarized the same thing in the following words:

“The method of solving the problems not mentioned in the Book and the traditions is the joint consultation of jurists and devoted scholars of Islam. Imposing the personal and individual opinion on the Muslims is forbidden.”

But for reasons unknown our modernists are allergic to this way of thinking. The traditional knowledge of the Qur'an and the Sunnah is not considered by them as an essential requirement for interpretation of and deductions from the Qur'an and the Sunnah, nor do they ‘think it necessary that such a person should necessarily’ be fearful of Allah and a devoted worshipper. For some time they have been making loud suggestion to this effect.

“There should be no monopoly of religious scholars” on the interpretation of Quran and the Sunnah. No papacy should be allowed in Islam. No particular group, therefore, can be given the right of legislations. “The interpretation of the Qur'an and the Tradition is the right of all Muslims and not of the religious scholars alone” — “Religious scholars cannot be given the power of veto in the affairs of Islam”, etc., etc.

These are the suggestions that are expressed in almost all the writings of the modernists. As far as the instructions of the Quran and the Traditions are concerned we have already submitted that the greatest emphasis has been laid down on the fundamental requirement of knowledge and devotion for interpreting the religion; but it seems proper here to discuss real frets, that are the source of these misunderstandings.

Their first suggestion is: “There is no Brahmanism or Papacy in Islam; hence the religious scholars cannot be given the exclusive rights of legislations”.

Either they are totally ignorant of the real meaning of papacy and theocracy and the ills in them, or they are deliberately deceiving the simple people of the Ummah. Anyone having the slightest sense of justice and the truth can understand that “knowledge” and “fearfulness of Allah” (Taqwa) is not limited to any race, color, caste or creed which one cannot achieve through his efforts and resources. It is the name of ‘Eligibility and Qualification’ of a specific objective which can be achieved by everyone at any time. If setting some qualifications for certain responsibilities is papacy, no section of life can be said to be devoid of it. The educational standard and moral character needed for the presidentship and ministership of a country would also be termed as “papacy”. The condition of being an expert on legal affairs for a judge would also be another form of “papacy”. The attainment of a law degree for legal advisor or advocate should also be called papacy. The condition of having relevant academic degrees for teaching in a university, college or school should be removed. The limit of age, intellect and normal character fixed for qualifying as a candidate in elections, should all be cancelled as they are different forms of “papacy”. But it is not so. Then how can the condition of “Knowledge” and “Taqwa”, for interpreting the Qur'an and the Tradition, be termed as papacy?

Anyone having a little knowledge of the term “Papacy” and “Brahmanism” cannot overlook the differences between the religious scholars of Islam and the Popes and Brahmans.

- (1) “Pope” and “Brahmans” are practically the titles of a specified class of color, caste and creed. Anyone outside these jurisdictions cannot enter into their fold despite all eligibilities and efforts. That is why we find dacoits and robbers becoming “Popes” in the history of the Christian church. Contrary to this, Religious scholar of Islam (Ulema) is an attribute for which there is no restriction of caste and creed. In the fourteen hundred years of the history of Islam we find religious scholars in every color or creed, even the slaves have emerged as great scholars of Islamic learning and accepted as leaders of the Ummah. The cause of their

dignified status had always remained their “Knowledge” and “Taqwa” rather than their parental background.

(2) The religion of which the Pope is claimed to be a spokesman is a religion which does not provide with guidance for the most important aspects of life. That is why the word of Pope has become the word of God, and no one else can defy this. Thus he is no more an interpreter of law but a free and independent law-maker. Contrary to this, the injunctions of the Book (Qur'an) and the Sunnah (Prophetic traditions) are universal and the rules and regulations for their interpretation are prescribed and preserved in their original form. Any scholar saying anything against these rules and regulations will be rejected by other scholars on the ground of these principles. A number of such scholars are always present to check such misinterpretations.

(3) The process of law-making and interpretation of religion in papacy ultimately ends on one man. He alone been regarded as the “Shepherd of the sheep of Messiah” and the Deputy of the founder of the church. Contrary to this, “Religious scholar” of Islam is not the name of any person who is the head of an organization, but anyone who has attained religious knowledge on true lines is a Religious scholar and an heir to the Holy Prophet. Hence no individual scholar has right to impose his personal views and whims on the entire Muslim Ummah.

In the presence of such an obvious difference between the roles of the Pope and of the Islamic scholars any one applying the term Papacy to the services of the Ulema simply exhibits his loss of knowledge and common intellect.

The second demand of the modernists, is that “there can be no monopoly of the Ulema on the Book and Traditions. Therefore, the right of their interpretation cannot be reserved for religious scholars alone”.

Those under the charm of this propaganda are tirelessly repeating this slogan and do not stop for a while to think that thus they are making themselves similar to a person who had never seen a medical college but raises the objection as to why the treatment of diseases has been served for qualified doctors only or like a fool who criticizes by saying why the experts in law and jurisprudence -

alone have the right of the interpretation of law and why not others are allowed to do so?

No sensible or conscientious person can ever think on these lines. However, if one has such an imbecile approach he should know that, any one has the right to perform all these duties, but to gain proficiency and eligibility for this you will have to spend years and years of hard work and labor, seeking the guidance from experts for practical experience, obtain degrees and diplomas and other related experience, then, of course, you will be allowed to make interpretations.

The most sensitive and delicate work of interpreting the Qur'an and the Sunnah is said to require the same process how can it be termed as a monopoly. Does it not require any one to get educated for it? Why the Qur'an and the Sunnah alone are considered to be as pitiable as to be treated by any individual at his own will? How one can be given the right to interpret the Qur'an and the Sunnah while he has not spent even a few months in acquiring the relevant knowledge.

They express their anger against the religious scholars all day long as to why they alone should deserve the right to interpret the Qur'an and the Sunnah? But they never reflect on the amount of pain and labor they have undergone to acquire this right? How in the two hundred years of British rule in India they had remained the target of the British atrocities and aggression? With all the doors of livelihood closed on them by the British rule they preferred to live on meager resources and devoted themselves to acquire this knowledge against all odds. They are still doing it despite the harassment from these modernists. How they their eyes glowed in front of the dim light of oil lamps of clay? And how they attempted to shape their lives in the mould of religion? If, after all that, the Holy Prophet (PBUH) gives them the right to interpret the Qur'an and his Sunnah, and the Muslims place their trust in them why is this resented by them?

The eagerness of modernists for interpreting the Book and the Traditions is certainly commendable; but for this they should also undergo the physical and mental strain needed for it. They, too, should spend some part of their life in trodding the roads to knowledge of the Qur'an and learn the manners of living on that

ground. If after that any one refuses to recognize them as interpreter of the Qur'an and the Traditions, then their complaint against the scholars would be justified.

Under the present circumstances their attitude is like what the poet said:

Those who hold their life dear to them  
Should not think of going to seek his beloved,

Your present state of mind has been well depicted by the poet of the East, Allama Iqbal, in this poem:

The knowledge of others you gained is a mere collection as if you have glowed your face with foreign cosmetics

You have given up your dignity so much that I cannot recognize you as yourself.'

Your mind is chained by the thoughts of others and the succession of breaths in your throat has a foreign source.

The tongue is yours but the speech is borrowed from others and so are your wishes in your mind.

The canaries wish to sing their own songs; the cypresses wish to be clad with their own foliage.

You borrow the wine from others in your goblet.

Even the cup you hold is not yours.

The Prophet is grieved, and the Creator asks Am I not there?" But for you! Alas! Alas!

Under these circumstances how can the Muslim Ummah entrust you with the responsibility of interpreting the Qur'an and Sunnah, who, with all their shortcomings, have saved their ideological entity as Muslims.

As for the claim that Dr. Fazlur Rehman has published in the monthly "Fikr-o-Nazar" in these words:

"In Islam the Muslim Ummah as a whole had been doing legislative work and it should still have the right to do so."

I wish they had further clarified what he meant by it. Does it mean that every individual of the Ummah should be allowed to become a legislator. Every illiterate and uncivilized person should be

entrusted with legislation. Or, does it mean that the Ummah as a whole enjoys the right to select some deserving, reliable and knowledgeable person from among them to be entrusted with this sacred job? In that case it will be a work of these selected people.

Obviously even the very staunch believer in democracy does not take the term democracy to mean that every single individual can interfere with each and every affair of the state. In fact, they hold that every matter and problem is to be entrusted to the experts of that field and those who lack knowledge in that trade have to place their trust on these experts, and it is not termed as an infringement of the rights of democracy.

After this analysis of the rights of people one can easily conclude who, out of one hundred and twenty million people of Pakistan, are worthy of trust in the matter of interpretation and exegesis of the Qur'an and the Traditions?

When any one of them really wants to understand the Qur'anic injunction or prophetic tradition would he seek the help of the Institute of Islamic Research or any other modernist institution or to those "Obscurantist" scholars whom the modernists blame to have robbed the people of their democratic right? If the multitude of Muslims turn to these scholars without any compulsion, pressure or legal restrictions, place their trust on them and their conscience get satisfied with it where does the democratic right of people get hurt. Who have injured the beliefs of the Muslim Ummah with their interpolation, the Ulema or these modernists is known to all.

Their last and biggest objection is on the condition of "Taqwa" (Fear of Allah, Piety, and Abstinence from evil-doings). According to them "Taqwa" like "knowledge" is not essential for interpreting the Qur'an. We do not understand what apprehension they have against it. According to them the complication in this regard is:

"The condition of "Taqwa" is a condition that, every scholar can reject the judgement of another scholar, because everyone has his own standard for Taqwa". (Fikr-o-Nazar Nov.67, p.326)

We may be allowed to say that ignore for a while your individual apprehension and there will be no complication in this matter. The

same ‘Multitude’ (Jamhur) whom they want to give the status of legislators is equally entitled to decide which of the scholar fulfils this condition of taqwa? Collectively the conscience of multitude of Muslims is never wrong. Their opinion is the will of Allah. Why should there be any hesitation in entrusting the job of interpretation of the Qur'an and traditions to a person whose Taqwa is accepted by the multitude?

It should be thoroughly understood that ‘Taqwa’ is not an ambiguous and unsettled term which can be given any meaning by anyone according to his individual liking. In Islam “Taqwa” is a legal Phrase and countless religious injunctions depend on it. Whenever it is used in a legal sense it would mean “practising the permissibles, abstaining from major sins and not insisting on minor sins.” In the phraseology of the Qur'an it is the opposite of “Fujur” (Apparent Sins, Immorality). The Qur'an says:

فَإِنْ شَاءُوا فَجُنُونٌ هُوَ أَفَقُنُوا هُمْ (٨) - (الشمس: ٨)

“Then inspired it (with conscience of) its wickedness and its piety.”

Hence anyone abstaining from “Fujur” is a man of Taqwa, and therefore the people shall have no difficulty in deciding about the piety and devotion (Taqwa) of a person. With this in view, one can easily conceive that there can be no complexity or difficulty arising from imposing the condition of knowledge and Taqwa for interpretation, explication or exegesis of the Qur'an and Prophetic tradition.”

In the end we would again like to humbly request the modernists that the use of Street slogans and propaganda weapons would neither render any service to the country or the nation nor can any problems be solved with them, nor would it leave any pleasant effect on any serious mind. In the hue and cry of their slogans at the most they can suppress the voice of truth for a short while. But that can only affect the ears, but not the hearts. A stage does come when the cries become hoarse and their throats get dry. It is then that the dignified voice of truth overcomes with full force, directly affects the hearts and stays permanently there.

## CHAPTER 7

### SCIENCE AND ISLAM

“Is the present day research about the moon, the sun and the planets in accordance with the Qur'an? There are some people who claim that there is no inconformity between science and the Qur'an and the Traditions, hence everything the science presents is correct, while others say that the views of science clash with the Qur'an. Kindly give your comprehensive view and opinion about it” (Question by Abdul Hai, Faridpur, East Pakistan now Bangladesh)

Answer: An elaborate answer of this question requires a comprehensive article. However, I am presenting certain things by way of principles hoping that they will be helpful to remove your doubt in this matter.

1. First of all it must be understood that the purpose of science is to explore the fundamental forces which Allah has created in this universe. If these forces are used for the welfare and well being of mankind it is not only permissible but desirable in Islam. Rather than raising obstacles in the way of such attempts Islam encourages them. In this connection Islam only demands that these forces should be used for purposes that are permissible and useful in the eyes of Islam. In other words, science aims at discovering the hidden forces of universe but the correct use of these forces is told by religion which provides proper direction and a better atmosphere for such attempts. Science and technology can be useful to mankind only if they are used on the principles laid down by Islam. Nobody would deny the fact that whereas science can be a means of welfare and material progress to mankind, its wrong and misdirected use can be disastrous for us. The example is before us. In recent years science has provided mankind with the means of comfort and ease, but at the same time its wrong use has converted the whole world into the hell of turmoil and disturbance. It is science that invented the high speed means of travel like the jet planes but at the same time the science is responsible of creating disastrous nuclear bombs, hence true benefits from

it can be achieved only when it is used according to the principles laid down by Allah.

2. The second thing to understand is that scientific discoveries are of two kinds. Firstly those which pertain to human observation. Such discoveries are never in opposition to the Qur'an and the Traditions. In fact, they have helped to affirm the Qur'an and traditions in many things which were difficult for people to understand. For example, the tremendous speed of the "Buraq" (The heavenly horse) on which the Prophet travelled from Makkah to Jerusalem on the night of Ascension, was regarded as unimaginable by the so-called intellectuals of that time. But science has today proved that the speed is a relative entity that cannot be bound to any limits. Secondly, there are some views that are based on conjectures and presumptions due to lack of knowledge, rather than observation and certainty. The scientists have not reached any definite conclusions on these matters so far. Such findings sometimes are opposed to the explicit views of the Qur'an and the traditions. In such situations the most proper way is to maintain firm faith in them without making new interpretation to the Qur'an. The scientific researches that clash with them should be regarded as yet inconclusive due to lack of knowledge about them. The more scientific knowledge keeps growing the more it will help to expound the realities described by the Qur'an and the traditions. For example, the scientists think that the "sky" has no physical existence. Obviously this hypothesis is not based on observation and definite proof but on the assumption that they have not been able to get any trace of the existence of the sky hence they do not accept its existence. In other words this hypothesis is based on "non existence of knowledge" rather than "knowledge of non-existence". Hence we, the believers in the Qur'an and the Traditions, assert with full confidence that this hypothesis of the scientists is not correct. According to the Qur'an and Tradition the skies do exist but due to its lack of knowledge science has not been able to discover it. If scientific knowledge continue to increase it is quite possible that the scientists realize their mistake and they accept the existence of the skies, just as they have accepted many other things which they had been denying earlier. The problem is that the tendency of looking everything in its own perspective is gradually fading away

from our minds. Whenever the importance of certain things dominates our mind we find it difficult to remain within bounds. Undoubtedly, science and technology is very useful and is an essential branch of learning, and in the present times it is an inevitable requirement for the Muslim Ummah to survive. It is not possible to attain their due place in the world today without science. But this certainly does not mean that any hypothesis proclaimed by a scientist based on conjectures and individual ideas should be accepted as true and given the status of Divine Revelation (Wahy) and the door of interpolations and alterations in the Qur'an and the Sunnah be opened, or doubts and suspicions be given air on this basis, particularly when it is often observed that scientific views and theories are changing every day.

3. It must be remembered that the case of Islam is quite different from that of Christianity. The latter did not have the very force and spirit to stand against newly arising needs and scientific discoveries of man. Hence science threatened it as a great danger. Thus, in order to uphold the prestige of the church, it was essential for Christianity either to oppose scientific achievements or make amendments in the religion itself. In the beginning the Roman Catholic Church adopted the first course. Having full power and authority on the people, the scientists, like Galileo, had to face tremendous punishments. But when the authority of church was made to lose its grip they had no alternatives than to make new interpretations and fabricate the religion itself. Hence the scholars of modernism adopted this way. It happened because the whole edifice of Christianity was erected on extremely unnatural and baseless grounds. Islam is a different religion. It is the natural religion and no sensible argument can challenge it. It is fully capable of fulfilling the needs of the time and to satisfy the demands of new circumstances without making any changes in the religion. Our belief is that the truth of Islam will flourish more and more with the advancement of science and scientific knowledge, provided that its point of view remains scientific in the real sense of the word and it does not give its conjectures the status of certainty and observation.

This is what the religious scholars of Islam think. It implies that everything must be looked in its true perspective. It will not be wise to cross the limits misled by sentimental slogans.

How strange it is that due to this moderate and absolutely reasonable attitude some people are constantly propagating that the scholars of Islam are opposed to science and technology and they do not like any progress in this field. We can only pray to Almighty Allah to bless them with common sense. Ameen.

## CHAPTER 8

### THE CONQUEROR OF SPACE

In the last few years the historical achievements attained by American scientists in the field of space technology, particularly the incident of man's landing on the moon, has attracted the attention of the entire world. Undoubtedly, the amazing journey of Apollos in to space has presented a wonderful exposure of human intellect. The success achieved by them is extremely valuable and a historical marvel from the scientific point of view. They have indeed demonstrated the highest accuracy of mathematical calculations and technological implementation of the scientific ideas. They are able to make prediction of extraordinary circumstances.

The first time man has examined the moon from so near through these spacecrafts. If a century ago somebody claimed that mail had reached the moon by flying in the space or that he had seen the earth rising from the horizon of the moon, it would have been considered a fabulous Story of the Arabian Nights. It is a reality today.

Every phase of this journey, right from the "take off" of the spacecraft to its successful landing on the earth, is an extremely amazing feat for the common man. From the Purely scientific point of view this journey is an achievement that can never be forgotten. But this is only one side of the Picture (Taking in view the end result of this wonderful journey reminds us of an incident that occurred at the time of Caliph Haroon-al-Rasheed.

It is stated that a certain person sought the permission of the Caliph to present an astonishing performance in his court. When the permission was granted he erected a needle upright on the floor and himself stood at some distance with a few needles in his hand. Then he took one of those needles in the other hand, aimed at the needle on the floor, and threw the needle in his hand toward it. People saw that this needle passed through the eye of the needle on the floor. He repeated this performance several times and never missed the target even once.

On seeing this astonishing feat the Caliph ordered, "Give him ten dinars, and punish him with ten lashes!" The courtiers asked for an explanation of this equally astonishing reward. The Caliph said, "He gets ten dinars for his accuracy of aim, truthfulness and ambition, as a reward. But he will get ten lashes as a punishment for spending his capabilities in a thing that is of no benefit to any one materially or spiritually."

This incident of the prudence and wit of Haroon-al Rasheed is fully applicable to the space-race of the present times. In fact one feels obliged to commend and praise the scientists on the remarkable feat of landing on the moon who have set unique records of their technical and intellectual skill and their courage and endurance. But when we see how much mental, financial and physical energy of mankind has been spent on this and what did humanity receive in return, this very achievement becomes an international crime.

Since there are several misunderstandings perplexing in the minds of the people we would discuss the matter in some detail.

There is a group of simple people who think that all these attempts to conquer moon and space are contradictory to the views of the Qur'an and the tradition and (God forbid) they are a challenge to the authority of God. So much so that, some people have been heard saying, purely out of love for Islam, that all the news about landing on the moon are fictions and they cannot be relied upon. But the fact is that if the scientists of America or Russia or any other country reach the moon or mars or any other planet, it does not in any way clash with the Qur'an and the traditions, nor does it affect the supreme authority of God. There is not a single verse of the Qur'an or narration of the Prophet which denies the ascent of man to moon or Mars or any other planet.

On the contrary, if those travelling in the space keep their eyes open to realities they will find clear signs of the truth of the Qur'an and the traditions. They will observe with their naked eyes the realities of many Islamic concepts which are made more comprehensible through the progress of the scientific knowledge, and which were previously mocked at by the blind followers of Rationalism. For instance, the description of the incredible speed of the 'Buraq' in the Holy Traditions, with reference to the Ascension, was regarded as fairy-tale by the so-called pioneers of

rationalism. But the astronauts of today have circled around the world in less than an hour and thus proved that speed is something that can not be confined to any limits. So when the American scientist and astronauts can exhibit such an astonishing super speed through the limited powers of their mind why can't the unlimited power of the Cherisher and Sustainer (Allah) of this universe give even a higher speed, to any of His creatures.

In short, we have firm belief, and there is nothing to shake it, that man is bound to salute and acknowledge the realities of the Qur'an and the Sunnah with the ever increasing progress of science and technology, if, of course, he remains within the bounds and does not claim his calculations to be scientific observations. The religion brought by the Holy Prophet Mohammed (PBUH) is not like the religion of Christianity which should be frightened by the progress of science. This is the religion which is the most symmetrical with human nature. It had openly proclaimed fourteen centuries ago that:

سُرُّهُمْ أَيْتَنَا فِي الْأَقَارِبِ وَفِي أَنْسِيْمَ حَتَّىٰ  
يَرَيْسُّنَّ لَهُمْ أَنَّهُ أَنْقُنْ -

“We shall soon show them Our signs in the horizons and within themselves, until it becomes clear to them that this is the Truth”.

(Ha Mim As Sajdah: 53)

Imam Razi has quoted earlier commentators to say that the ‘signs in the Horizons’ means the wonders of the skies, moon and stars and the elements. The phrase “We will show our signs” means that these wonders have no limits. Thus Allah will continue exhibiting new wonders in every era of time.

On the other side there is a group among the Muslims who are so much dazzled with the grandeur of science that they see nothing more valuable, more important and worth following than throwing rockets on the planets. The overawed tone and longing with which these people talk of this type of scientific advancement gives an impression that for them the most fortunate and exalted and benefactor of mankind is the nation that has performed this wondrous feat, and most deprived are those who have lagged behind in this “sacred” race.

You must have heard people saying “the world has entrapped the moon and planets but the Muslims are still entangled in the problems of Salah, fasting, marriage and divorce.” This expression actually depicts the same mentality that the Western nation has surpassed all other nations in every walk of life by inventing the rockets and satellites, and hence the solution to all our problems must be sought by following the footsteps of the West.

In fact both these trends are dangerous. We have no hesitation in acknowledging that this is an amazing achievement, and from the scientific point of view, it is a great success of man. But the question arises whether this “achievement” was worth attempting in view of the price man had to pay for it? There are many who take pleasure out of the success of space explorations but very few know what quantity of wealth was spent in each of these space journeys? The expenses incurred on Apollo-8 were one trillion and twenty billion rupees (Jang, Karachi, 14 January 1969). This amount was equivalent to at least twenty annual budgets and six years of national income of Pakistan. In other words the amount spent by Pakistan in twenty years and the money earned by 100 million people of Pakistan in six years was spent on only one space journey. It is the amount spent only on the journey of the Apollo-8. The journey of Apollo-10 must have cost far more money than the Appalo-8. It is equal to the money that could be spent by Pakistan in 80 years.

The question arises can it be the act of anyone having the slightest compassion for mankind to spend billion and trillions of rupees in a space journey in a world where people are massacred by hunger and poverty, where millions of people are begging for a loaf of bread, where countless people die for not being able to get the medicines required for their ailment, where about half the population remain deprived of education facilities? In America itself which has the “honor” of performing the “great achievement” a report was published in the same month in which one trillion and twenty billion rupees were spent on Apollo-8, that one out of every nine persons is destitute, and that:

“Poverty is the greatest material problem of today” (Weekly “Time” New York, 24 January 1969, p 29)

This huge expenditure on the useless probe of space in a country like America cannot be justified for a nation who claims to be sympathetic to mankind. It seems that Sa'adi had been addressing the astronauts of today when he said:

تو کار زمیں رانکو ساختی  
کہ با آسمان نیز پر داختی

You have well solved the problems of the earth  
That you are going to play with the heavens.

If a man from the East tries to show the other side of the picture of space-race, it may be said that he is saying it due to his jealousy for Western advancement. Hence we present the comments of a renowned historian and thinker of the West itself on this subject. A very thoughtful article of a distinguished historian and philosopher of England Dr. Arnold Tyne Bee has been published. We are presenting herewith a summary of its excerpts from Pakistan Times of 6th. January 1969. After admitting the wondrous feat of space achievements he writes:

“Even today 10% or 20% of American population comprises of indigent people. Looking at the world as a whole only one third of its increasing population is such as is getting proper food. Hence utilization of the economic resources of mankind is in the foolish pursuits of erecting the Pyramids of Egypt or landing on the moon, which, in themselves, are included in the list of the crimes.

“The world of today is involved in three wars. Individual strikes are getting frequent, students are protesting everywhere and different ways of terrorism are being adopted. All this is happening under the disgraceful feeling that use of force is the only way to attract attention of people when one is offended.

“People of Russia and America had been congratulating each other on their space achievements although the main cause of this “stupidity” had been their own rivalries. If these two political powers had not been in combat with each other on the small planet of Earth this “stupidity” would not have occurred.

“From the very early days of history of human activities, the technical advancement and moral degradation of man are becoming inseparable. The history of our science and technology is indeed a wonderful “Tale of achievements” but the history of our mutual relations has been proved to be a story of grief and regrets on our failures. This is the moral “gap” which after 1945 A.D. has widened to the extent that it has opened a vast channel for disaster to enter.”

“In this atomic age, the priority must be given to save ourselves from the crime of wasting the lives of other human beings. For this it is essential that a Supreme government be formed on the universal level and all local governments be placed under it. But this is becoming even more difficult, than landing on the moon because at present Nationalism has become as sacred as an idol. To part with a false deity needs a greater courage and bravery in this world than is needed by the astronauts.

“Next in the list of priority comes making effective arrangements to produce food for the population on this earth. We do not know the extent to which the world population would have gone by the time the movement of family planning gains popularity throughout the world. However we do know that we should not waste a single moment to increase the supply of food. The fast moving technological progress should equally speed up the productivity in every field.

“These are the two most important targets before mankind while space adventures can not be of any service to any of them.

“Hence the fact is that conquering of space is an absolutely wasteful exercise, and by spending our energies in this direction we are intentionally imposing on ourselves huge economic liabilities. We cannot, and should not ignore our economic problems at a time when the human race is heading fast toward starvation.

“As to the question that, in case we put the space program at the bottom of our agenda and delete the preparation of war from it, what alternate use of the scientific knowledge of our inventors be?

“The question has already been answered by the Japanese government. The researches of our scientists should be directed to

explore the resources hidden in the sea instead of wasting them in space and war strategies.

“The sea is within the reach of man as against the nearest planet from the earth. Two-third area of our planet is water and it is a huge treasure of the unknown resources. It has been estimated that there exists the greatest store of natural resources in the sea which remains yet unexplored.

“This is a vast field of research for man and in addition to satisfying the desire for research it may also provide a surety that the population will not die of starvation even if it increases ten-fold of the current population.

“A yellow female fish lays one million eggs during its life span, but under ordinary circumstances only three fully grown fish can be produced that would be capable of laying further eggs. But when Japan’s “sea-farmers” tried to enhance the ability of these eggs artificially and nurtured the stock of eggs and protected them from other animals it resulted in the production of 100,000 fish from the eggs of one fish.

“When Apollo-8 returned after its victorious flight I received a telephone call from across the Atlantic a few hours after it, “Do you think this is a revolutionary incidence in the history of mankind?”

My answer was ‘NO’.

“My answer could have been ‘Yes’ if the news of that day had been that humanity has suddenly regained its consciousness and it has formed a universal central state, and their researchers have discovered from the depth of the sea things that can be used by mankind for its collective purposes.” We have yet to achieve this revolutionary aim, and for that the first step of the world powers should be to divert their resources towards the collective advancement of human beings instead of wasting them in space adventures and war weapons. If this is achieved the population of the entire world can be brought to the standard of living now enjoyed by 80% of American peoples.

‘This will indeed be a ‘Revolutionary incidence’ but this will not be achieved through technology alone. If one wants to reap fruits through the power of technology the essential condition for it is a spiritual revolution. This spiritual surgery is our dire need and without it all our recently discovered material resources would be useless. Even if we land on the moon without the spiritual revival the dust and ashes obtained from there will mock at our spiritual bankruptcy from which we could not get our motherland rid of.’

In this article Dr. Tyne Bee has made a wise diagnosis of the disease, and if you give a little thought you will know that the root cause of this disease is that the people tracking the heavenly bodies have no definite aim or any exalted motto of life. All the ways of their struggle have been lost in their childish desire of surpassing others. The result is that they have not been able to utilize their unlimited capabilities for conquer of this universe that could lead mankind to the goal of peace and tranquility. All their energy is being spent in combating with each other, in surpassing or defeating each other; and in this struggle they have overlooked what great harm they have inflicted on themselves.

A race between the two parties, no matter how fast and speedy it is, cannot be of any benefit to humanity if it is not in the right direction. Tyne Bee was right in saying that spiritual surgery was needed to take full advantage of science. But what he does not know is that such a surgical treatment cannot be possible without submission to the greatest benefactor of mankind, Muhammad (Peace of Allah be upon him) who had made the return trip to heavenly destination far beyond the Moon, Mars, Venus and Pluto, and which is beyond the scientific imagination. Instead of directing his followers to conquer the moon he asked them to conquer the hearts and souls of the people. Unless the world kneels down to his feet and seeks guidance from Him, it will never be able to acquire peace and tranquility, though it may launch numerous artificial satellites or plant its flags on the moon or Mars or any other planets. After the landing on the moon all further advancement of science in this direction will prove more disastrous for mankind and only add to the uneasiness and darken the clouds of suffering and distress over the mankind.

The great philosopher-poet of the East has rightly said:

ڈھونڈنے والا ستاروں کی گزرا گا ہوں کا  
 اپنے انکار کی دنیا میں سعفہ کر رہ سکا  
 جس نے سورج کی شعاعوں کو گزرا کیا  
 زندگی کی شب تاریک سحر کر رہ سکا  
 اپنی حکمت کے خود بیچ میں الجھا ایسا  
 آج تک فیصلہ نفع و ضرر کرنے سکا

“The one, who is seeking the paths of heavenly bodies, could not travel in the world of his own thoughts. He captured the rays of the sun, but could not turn his night into the dawn of life. He was so much involved in the perplexities of his logic that he remains unable to decide between the gain and loss.”

## CHAPTER 9

### ISLAM AND THE CONQUER OF THE UNIVERSE

The Holy Qur'an has expounded the fact in many places that the entire universe has been created for mankind and every particle has been placed for the service of human beings. It stated:

مُّوَالِدِيْ خَلَقَ لَكُمْ مَا فِي الْأَرْضِ جِيْعَانًا

“He is (Allah) Who created for you all that is in the earth.” (2:29)

وَسَخَّرَ لَكُمْ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ جِيْعَانًا  
لَّمَّا فِي ذَلِكَ لَذِيْلَاتٍ لَّمَّا فِي دُنْدُلَاتٍ

“And He (Allah) has subjugated to you all that is in the heavens and all that is in the earth, altogether from Him. Surely in that are signs for a people who reflect.” (45:13)

In these verses while describing His bounties Allah has made subtle indication that since all these things have been created for Man it is Man's duty to get knowledge and explore them by applying his logic and wisdom bestowed on him by Allah, for the benefit of Mankind. He should put to his use all resources that Allah has stored in the universe. There are two kinds of bounties of Allah created in the universe. The things that are general which man uses in his life, yet there are some bounties which can be acquired by the use of knowledge and wisdom. The Qur'an said:

أَلَّمْ تَرَأَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ سَخَّرَ لَكُمْ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَأَنْ يَعْلَمَ  
عَلَيْكُمْ كُلُّ نِعْمَةٍ ظَاهِرَةٌ وَّبَاطِنَةٌ -

“Have you not seen how Allah has subjugated to you whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth, and He has perfected His blessings on you, (both) open and hidden?” (31:20)

In other words, Allah has indeed subjugated the universe to Man yet it does not mean that he shall get all these blessings without

striving for them and using physical and mental talents for achieving them.

At another place the Holy Qur'an said:

أَللّٰهُمَّ إِنَّمَا سَخَّرْنَا لَكُمُ الْبَحْرَ لِتَجْرِيَ الْفُلْكُ فِيهِ بِمَا مَرِيَهُ  
وَلِتَبَتَّغُوا مِنْ فَضْلِهِ وَلَعَلَّكُمْ تَشَكُّرُونَ -

"Allah is He who has subjugated the sea to you that the ships may sail through it by His command, and that you may seek of His bounty and that you may offer thanks." (Q.45: 12)

In this verse the cause for subjugation of sea has been described as providing it as a means of seeking Allah's blessings and bounties. In the Qur'an "seeking Allah's bounty" generally means "striving for earning the livelihood". Hence, one meaning of this verse may be that mankind has been given authority and power of navigation on the sea so that they may trade through it. Some commentators have, however, stated that "seeking Allah's bounty" in this verse does not mean trade but research and exploration of countless other bounties that He has created in the sea. The verse then means: "We have subjugated the sea for you after creating in it innumerable useful things so that you may seek for them and make use of them". Thus, every now and then the discoveries of modern science are making it apparent that the treasures of mineral and botanical products hidden in the sea are far more than those on the earth.

The Qur'an has explicitly pointed out at various places that even new bounties of this universe will get exposed as often as man would march forward in the way of research and exploration. For example, where the Qur'an has mentioned horses and mules as means of transport, it has further pointed out that in future there will come out such means of transport which man did not know at that stage.

وَالْجِنُّ وَالْبَعَالَ وَالْحَمِيمُ لِتَرْكُوْهَا وَرِزْنَهُ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا لَمْ تَعْلَمُوا -

"(Allah has created for you) horses, mules and donkeys that you may ride on them, and (in future) He will create such things which as yet you don't know." (16:8)

In this manner the Qur'an has pointed out to all kinds of means of communication to be invented till the Last Day.

At another place it said:

سَنُرِيدُهُ أَيْمَانًا فِي الْأَفَاقِ وَفِي أَنْفُسِهِمْ حَتَّىٰ يَتَبَيَّنَ لَهُمْ  
أَنَّهُمْ بِالْحَقِّ -

“We shall show them Our signs, in the universe and also in their selves until it is clear to them that this (Qur'an) is the Truth.”

(53:41)

This verse signifies that the exposition of Allah's attribute of creation will never cease to create. The new blessings and productions will keep appearing in every era of time till the Last Day.

Many more statements from the Qur'an and prophetic traditions can be produced on this subject, but even if these few verses are positively reflected upon, the reality will be exposed as broad daylight that if access through research, investigation, experiments and discoveries is made to the hidden powers of universe with rightful intentions and rightful methods, it is not condemnable in the eyes of the Quran, it is desirable. And not only has Islam not laid down any restriction on such scientific experiments, it has, in fact, encouraged them. This is the reason why Muslims have left lasting impressions of their scientific endeavors which will continue to serve as guidelines for mankind.

However, it must be remembered that the concept of conquering the universe as presented by Islam is quite different from the materialistic concept of the West. The West has also undertaken the task of conquering it, and indeed in the last few years they have attained extraordinary successes in this field. But the first and fundamental difference of Islam with the West is that their restricted material visualization of things has deprived them of seeing the vast world beyond matter. Hence whatever new inventions are made by them are regarded as the fruits of their own power, intellect and labor. They do not perceive the active hand of

the Creator or Master behind these discoveries. But the vision of Islam sees things beyond the investigations, experiments and discoveries and it observes the supreme power of creation of Allah behind them. Allah has subjugated the entire universe for mankind on one hand, and on the other hand He has bestowed man with the intellect, wisdom, power and energy through which he has been able to dominate the forces of this universe. Hence the teaching of Islam is that after the success gained in the process of subjugation of universe he should kneel down before his Creator and Master in humble submission rather than be proud and arrogant. It is Allah who awarded him with the honor of ruling over the entire universe. According to the Qur'anic teaching the call of a true Muslim on such occasions is:

سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ الَّذِي سَخَّرَ لَنَا هَذَا وَمَا لَكُنَّا لَهُ مُقْرِنِينَ  
وَإِنَّا إِلَيْهِ مُنْتَهُونَ۔

“Glorified be He Who has subjugated (all) this to us and we ourselves were not capable to do it, And surely to our Lord we shall return.” (43:13)

The second fundamental difference between Islam and the West with regard to the conquering of the universe is that the ultimate object of the Western efforts in this direction is the conquering of the universe itself.

According to them, the aim of a man's life, is nothing more than gaining the maximum benefit and pleasure out of the universe and depart from this world. Contrary to this, subjugation of the universe, in the eyes of Islam, is not the final aim by itself; but it is a means to achieve the goal, and only a milestone on the path of a man's destination. The Islamic point of view is that Man gets the right to utilize the services of this universe only when he fulfills the purpose of his creation and discharges his duties rightly and sincerely. Almighty Allah has not subjugated this universe to man without purpose and the purpose is that man should perform the duty imposed on him with precision and honesty. This duty is worship and submission to Allah.

Allah said:

وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّةَ وَالْأُنْوَنِ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونَ -

“And I have not created the Jinn and mankind but to worship Me”.  
(51:56)

The third fundamental difference between the West and Islam is that any new force or power which man comes to possess as a result of his struggle for dominating the universe can be applied or used for any purpose that is allowed by human reason. But Islam teaches that the purpose of its use is determined by Almighty Allah who has bestowed that power to man, hence these inventions and discoveries can be used only for the objectives permitted by Him. When man determines by himself the purpose without the guidance of Divine Revelations these bounties of the universe may sometimes lead him to the path of destruction instead of giving any benefit to mankind. This results in the fact that despite hoisting his flag on the moon and Mars his own life seems to fall into the abyss of darkness. Thus the Islamic concept of subjugation of universe is more universal and comprehensive than that of the West, and more beneficial for Mankind.

May Almighty Allah give us the ability to recognize its true values and to practice them in the right direction. (Ameen)

# CHAPTER 10

## IJTEHAD

In the year 1404 A.H a convention of Ulema (Religious scholars) was held in Islamabad under the auspices of the Ministry of Religious Affairs, Pakistan. In the open session of this convention the president of Pakistan, Gen. Zia ul Haq, was also present. One of the topics of this convention was "How to start the process of Ijtehad in the country?". The extempore speech of the Editor of Al-Balagh given on this occasion has now been published in a booklet by transcribing it from the Tape-recorded speech which is reproduced below.

Mr. President, distinguished audience, As-salam-o-Alaikum.

I conceive that the recommendations submitted by the four committees of this convention in this short time are promising and encouraging. When this program was being announced yesterday it was not expected that such solid recommendations could be prepared in such a short time. But, on the whole, the recommendations prepared by all the four committees are very commendable and encouraging. Every person had to be a member of one of these committees therefore a member of certain committee did not get a chance to express his views before other committees. I, therefore, seek to express my views with regard to the problems that were discussed by the committees that did not have me as a member.

The committee which dealt with the ways and means to enhance the speed of Islamization, which is the real object of this convention, has done a remarkable job. I fully endorse every word of the recommendations by this committee and also request that they should be given thorough consideration and be examined with all their intentions and spirits and immediate action should be taken.

Similarly the recommendations made by the Unity and Consonant committee are also very encouraging and in fact, if they can be put to practice they will play a very effective role in checking the epidemics of disunity and disruption.

Just now I want to draw your attention to the third committee which has been formed in connection with the process of “Ijtehad”, and its recommendations have been presented by Moulana Muhammad Malik Kandhalvi and ‘Allama Syed Muhammad Razi Mujtahid. Since this gathering is, more or less, a representative gathering of Ulema (Religious scholars), I think the decisions taken here will have a far reaching effect. Hence I wish to state that contradicting misunderstandings are present about “Ijtehad” in our society at present. As a result at times we notice an extreme degree of inactivity and at other times an equal degree of over activity in this field.

In my opinion, and this is not my individual or exclusive opinion but it is derived from the Qur'an, Hadith and verdicts of jurists of Islam, that “Ijtehad” is like a double- edged sword. If it is properly understood, and used within its limitations of fulfilling the conditions laid down for it, this can be a source of great treasure of Islamic laws and a matter of great pride for the nation. But if it is allowed to be wrongly used by incapable persons it will result in creating false concepts and irreligious movements as we read in the books like ‘Al-milal Wan-Nahi’. Those views and claims had their sway for sometime but now they exist only in the pages of ancient books.

The same Ijtehad can be used to find practical ways for the Muslim Ummah, and the same can lead to such ridiculous interpretations as were advanced in our country. The Qur'an said:

وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَحْتَدِرُونَ فَاقْطُعُوا أَيْدِيهِمْ

“And as the thief, man or woman, cut off the hands of both.” (5:38)

This Qur'anic verse was interpreted that “thief man and thief woman” means “capitalists”; and “cut off their hands” signifies “Nationalize their industries”. This interpretation has not been made by a person of ordinary literary status, but by a person of our country who is, supposed to be a renowned intellectual.

Similarly, in this country it has been expounded through Ijtehad that “interest” is not forbidden, and that intoxicants are also

permissible. It is through the same type of Ijtehad that they tried every evil of Western Civilization to make permissible; and it is through this that an endless chain of religious manipulations has been started.

It is in this context that I have called it a double-edged sword. If it is not used with necessary precautions and some one starts attempting it without having the required proficiency he would open the door to distorting the religion, and would lead to extreme degree of misleading conceptions.

Some people think that “Ijtehad” allows taking a decision through personal opinion in religious matters. This must be fully understood that this practice has never been regarded as “Ijtehad” in Islam. The one who considers it as “Ijtehad” has in fact fallen into great error. The door of “Ijtehad” had been opened by the Holy Prophet (PBUH), and the Hadith reported by Ma’ az bin Jabal has made it clear.

The Prophet asked Ma’az “How will you decide on a thing not found in the Book of Allah?” He replied, “I will follow the Prophetic traditions (Sunnah). The Prophet then asked, “What would you do if you find nothing in Sunnah?” He replied, I will do “Ijtehad” with my personal opinion.” It is quite apparent from this Hadith that there is no room for “Ijtehad” in matters explicated by the Qur’an and the Sunnah. If someone attempts Ijtehad in such matters it will not be called “Ijtehad” but fabrication or distortion.

If “Ijtehad” could be permitted in matters where explicit injunctions from the Qur’an and Hadith are present, there was no need for the advent of Prophets and Messengers. The purpose of Wahy (Divine Revelation) was that the right way be shown to people through Wahy in matters where Man cannot make the correct decision through his intellect. Had it been an open field for everyone, to do as he or she thinks proper there was no need to follow the Qur’an or Prophetic traditions. It would have been sufficient to say that people should lead their lives according to their personal likings, opinions and reasoning as the time and circumstances demand. This misunderstanding must be removed about the application of Ijtehad, and whatever resolutions are passed must fully observe this point.

Sometimes, however, “Ijtehad” is not taken as a freedom of opinion to prevail over the Qur'an and tradition, but whenever the process of “Ijtehad” is discussed an impression is given that the Qur'an and traditions have been revealed to us for the first time and no work has been done in the field of interpretation and explanation for all these fourteen hundred years and that the meanings deduced by us through personal reasoning shall be “Ijtehad” that must be implemented.

This concept is sometimes deliberately propagated while the fact is that we are not living in a vacuum but we are living in an era which has the background of fourteen centuries of laudable efforts in the field of Qur'anic learning by renowned companions of the Prophet, their followers, religious scholars, jurists of Islam and devoted personalities of the Ummah. They have spent their lives in devotion to the cause of exegesis of the Qur'an and interpretation of the Prophetic traditions, and the sacrifices they have made for this cause are beyond our imagination. They had to go through the troubles of starvation and rough clothing and poorest means of sustenance for this noble cause and left behind a huge collection of this work. Now, throwing all this collection in a dust-bin and start making fresh interpretations, through the agency of “Ijtehad” unsupported by the Quran and the Sunnah, it will be an act of shameful self deception. It will mean that all the collections of the jurists be ignored and totally a new Fiqh of Islam should be prepared.

A sensible solution, however, that answers the new problems may be sought in the light of existing rules and principles derived from the Qur'an and traditions. This is the right application of “Ijtehad” in the right direction. Indeed countless problems may arise in every new period that are not defined by the Quran and the Prophetic traditions or no answer to these problems is provided by the available Fatawa(verdicts) of the jurists. Being within these limits and seeking the solutions to newer problems and understanding the intentions of jurists and the intentions of the Shariah is called true “Ijtehad” and this is the “Ijtehad” whose doors have not been closed to anyone so far.

This is a sheer propaganda that the door of Ijtehad is closed. Nobody has ever closed it. This door has been opened by the Holy Prophet and shall remain open till the Last Day, and as long as this

Ijtehad remains in capable hands nobody can close it. This is the type of Ijtehad that is needed in the present time. Countless problems have come up before us about whom we find no explicit injunctions or there are practical difficulties in their implementations. The door of Ijtehad is open for solving these problems.

Here I wish to point out that the topic of the committee has been phrased "How to start the process of Ijtehad in Pakistan?" The sentence seems to claim that the process of Ijtehad has not been started out so far, and now it is being started which was not in practice before. I wish to submit that this supposition is not correct. The required Ijtehad which the Muslim Ummah really needs is not a new thing. It was in practice before. If now an organized method is provided to it, it would be appreciable. But to think that the scholars of Islamic learning had not been doing this Ijtehad before is not correct. The true Ijtehad that is needed had been in process and should continue to be there in the future.

What we said above was about the principles in this regard. The recommendation of the committee that has come before us is that a Board of the Ulema (The Religious scholars) be formed to carry out Ijtehad and present their opinions on new problems. In this connection, I may be allowed to point out an important Islamic practice. The history of fourteen hundred years of Islam reminds us that, Islam never formed a supreme authoritative institution or clergy, an institution whose opinion should be the last word depriving everyone the right of criticism as is the case with Christianity. It is in Christianity that Pope is regarded as beyond all errors and infallible to everything.

The system in Islamic Ijtehad has been that no authoritative organization with absolute powers was ever formed. The opinion of the Ulema carrying out Ijtehad are publicized and are open to free criticism by other Ulema and ultimately the decision about their being right or wrong is made only on the basis of the collective consensus of the Ummah to accept an Ijtehad or reject it. Hence, if the intention of creating a Board of Ijtehad is that its interpretations are imposed on the Muslims as the last word, and other Ulema are not allowed to express their opinion against it, then in my opinion this is not a right objective.

Another thing to be noted is that establishing an institution exclusively for Ijtehad at this time may have some practical problems and may call for some financial implications as well. Hence I propose that we have already got an institution by the name of “Council for Islamic Ideology” and another institution by the name of “Institute of Islamic Research”, this responsibility may be entrusted to them. As has been proposed by the committee, a comprehensive list of the problems which need Ijtehad be prepared and handed over to these institutions. However the officials of these institutions should not limit these considerations to themselves but they should invite other Ulema and scholars of the country to express their opinion before a decision is announced by the Council for Islamic Ideology. It will reduce the financial burden on the one hand, and on the other the duplication of work will be eliminated. Otherwise the new Board for Ijtehad in the presence of the Council of Islamic Ideology may give birth to new problems. If a difference arises between the two institutions a third committee or institution will be needed to remove it. Hence it will be better if the Council of Islamic Ideology or Institute of Islamic Research are entrusted the work of preparing a list of such problems and then call for the renowned, qualified jurists and devoted scholars of Islam for a joint session, and take guidance from them and then arrive at a unanimous conclusion.

It has been reported with authentic sources in the tradition of Majm'a-al-Zawa'id by Hadhrat Ali bin Abi Talib that the Prophet (PBUH) was asked “We may be faced with problems, after you, in which there may be neither a command nor prohibition from you. What should we do in a situation like this?” In quite a few words the Prophet provided us with the right way. He said, “Consult the jurists (Legal experts) and the devotees cognizant with religion, and do not impose individual opinion as if it was the collective view of the Ummah”. He thus advised to call for people having two qualifications that is, they are jurists and devoted to the cause of Islam, consult them and then reach a conclusion.

If the Council of Islamic Ideology and Institute of Islamic Research keep these principles in view and consult the Ulema when needed, then publish their opinion allowing open freedom of criticism to other Ulema. Anyone having opposing views should be allowed to express himself. In this way the process of Ijtehad can continue in

the same manner as it had been continuing over the last fourteen years. In case we adopt self conceived means and methods we cannot hope to make the desired progress.

In the end I wish to submit that any such institution if formed under the supervision of the State it is essential to take into consideration the fact that governments keep changing and rulers are replaced. Hence it should be formed on the principles which keep them practicable under all circumstances. Thus the selection of the workers should be made on the basis of knowledge and devotion rather than on political grounds. If this factor is effectively incorporated in the basic terms of reference of such institutions, the process of Ijtehad will, by the Grace of Allah, be a source of blessing to us, and we shall be able to guard against the dangers which could be created by the wrong use of Ijtehad in our society.

With these reservations I endorse the recommendations of the committee.

# CHAPTER 11

## AGGRESSIVE AND DEFENSIVE JEHAD

### An Answer To A Letter:

**Question:** Respected Moulana Muhammad Taqi Usmani Sahib,  
Assalam-o-Alaikum wa Ralunatullah-wa Barakatuhu.

My humble self had recently had a chance to read some older editions of your esteemed journal “Al-Balagh”. In the issue of March 1971, I found the following suggestions under clauses 17, 18 on page 10.

- (17) Compromising relations and amicable treatment could be established with such non-Muslim states as may not be hostile to Islam and Muslims.
- (18) Agreements made with other countries shall be honored if they are permissible under Islamic Law, otherwise such agreements will be declared dissolved.

From these clauses it is apparent that non-Muslim states can retain their non-Muslim status in the presence of an Islamic state if they are non-hostile or hold a treaty or agreement.

In other words, the Islamic State will not wage Jihad for propagation of Islam against them, even though, I think, peaceful preaching of Islam would continue in them also, and any interference therein by a non-Muslim state shall be an open proof of hostility. Anyway, my humble self is in full agreement with both these clauses, because my view is that the real job of Muslims is preaching of Islam throughout the world rather than attaining a power for total elimination of unbelievers from the earth and establishing an Islamic State everywhere (which is the view of Moududi sahab).

However attempts (through Aggressive Jihad) must be made against hostile and non- compromising non-Muslim states to subdue them in order to be safe from their mischief.

But in the issue of June 1981 in the critique of the book “Mukhtasar Seerat-e-Nabawiyah” by Moulana Abdul Shakoor Lakhnavi, after quoting the following excerpt from the book:

“The religious obligation of Jihad is only for the oppressed and for eradicating cruelties . . . in other words Jihad is the name of protection of self determination..., hence considering the battles of the Prophetic era as devoid of defensive and protective measures is not only irreligious but is illogical also.”

You have commented,

“From these sentences it appears that only Defensive Jihad is permissible while the real purpose of Jihad is propagation of Islam” which means “To establish the supremacy of Islam and damage the authority of the infidels”.

“ For this purpose taking initiative for Jihad is not only permissible but at times obligatory and a means for reward from Allah. Apart from the Qur'an and traditions, the entire history of Islam is full of such Jihads. We need not make excuses and adopt apologetic attitude simply for the objections coming from non-Muslims. No single person has ever been forced to accept Islam nor is it permitted; otherwise the Islamic institution of ‘Jizyah’ would have been meaningless. Muslims’ sword has, however, been raised to establish the grandeur of Islam. If anybody wants to stay in the darkness of disbelief; he may do so, but the rule of Allah must prevail in the world created by Him. Muslims wage Jihad to raise the name of Allah and to subdue His rebels. Why should we feel shy in expressing this fact before people whose entire history is full of blood-shed for colonialism, and who have massacred millions of people simply to satisfy their lust and greed.”

I wish to make two submissions to you about this critique.

Firstly in my opinion it is wrong to deduce from the extracted sentences of Moulana Abdul Shakoor that in his opinion only defensive Jihad is permissible, while he has also written that “Jihad is the name of protection of self determination” which can include every offensive Jihad.

Moulana Thanavi has stated:

“Jihad is meant to defend Islam and protect self determination..... with this it should not be thought that initiative for Jihad should not be taken. The purpose of an initiative itself is this defense and protection because there is great chance of resistance. It is for checking this resistance that Jihad is obligated. In short the defense that provides a motive for Jihad is general against defense for existing situation and defense for anticipated resistance in future.” (Al-Afadat-alYoumiya, Letter No: 497 voL 6).

Moulana Abdul Shakoor must have been aware of many Aggressive Jihads of the Holy Prophet (PBUH), and hence he cannot call such Jihads as unlawful. He, however, considers all the Jihads of the Prophet as Defensive and Protective because the purpose of all of them had been to break the force of Pagans of Arabia for the defense and protection of the integrity of Islam and Muslims so that the Religion of Truth may gain power in the region. When this purpose was achieved Allah revealed verse 3 of Surah Ma’idah on the occasion of the Last Hajj:

“This day have those who disbelieve despaired of your religion, so fear them not, but fear you Me. This day have I perfected your religion for you and completed My blessing on you, and have approved Al-Islam as Din (Code of life) for you”.

Obviously the Moulana has meant to include both Aggressive and Defensive Jihads under ‘Protection of integrity of Islam.’ However, it would have been better if he had further classified it to avoid misunderstanding by the reader.

The second thing, which had specially been the prime cause of writing this letter, is to express my views about your critique so that you may either endorse or contradict it. (In case of contradiction, arguments of the Qur'an and Sunnah will be needed). My views will become clear to you from the following: You have given the real purpose of Aggressive Jihad as Propagation of Message of Allah which, according to you, is to be manifested with supremacy of Islam and establish its grandeur and breaking that of disbelief and Paganism so that the rule of Allah may prevail in a world created by Him. For this to understand we must first determine the meaning of the Kalimah of Allah (Message of Allah). In view of my humble self every reasonable,

true, correct and just word is the Kalimah of Allah or the Kalimah of the Truth. To make it dominating over every unreasonable, false, incorrect and unjust thing or to make people believe the meanness and evils of the latter and elegance and grace of the former is the Kalimah of the Truth or the Kalimah of Allah. Supremacy of a thing signifies that it exists in a dominant trait. For example, domination of ignorance means the illiteracy of majority of people, dominance of ‘world’ means that most of the people are involved in worldly pursuits and do not discriminate between the lawful and forbidden things. The domination of the West means that majority of people have adopted Western civilization and style of life, domination of Hanafiyat means majority of people belonging to Hanafi school of thought, etc. etc. Thus, supremacy or domination of Islam would mean that most people are its true followers, and this (religious) domination of Islam is that is required. If ‘Kalimah of Allah’ is taken to mean Islam, then the propagation of Allah’s Kalimah would mean similar type of domination of it. The method of acquiring such domination cannot be anything but convincingly preaching and producing exemplary character of the preachers and their people. This is what can cause a revolution in the hearts and minds of non-Muslims. This cannot be achieved by making them the subjects of an Islamic State, because in a situation like this the inferiority complex and the subjective feelings would to some extent prohibit them to listen to the Kalimah. Hence, Aggressive Jihad does not result in domination of the religion of Islam but in that of a political domination of Muslims, and it is their own domination that is established and not that of Islam. The grandeur of Islam means that Muslims practice the teachings of the Qur'an and Prophetic Traditions in Toto. For a political domination and grandeur their being even good Muslims is not essential, and it does not even result in the establishment of Rule of Allah on the world created by Him. As the non-Muslims would continue to abide by their entire life style after paying “Jizyah”. Intoxicants and pork would not be prohibited for them nor would they be stoned to death for rape. Their family laws would remain in place and adultery would remain unrestricted. If for some reasons the majority of non- Muslim citizens did not embrace Islam this political domination will continue only as long as the Islamic state is powerful. In case it gets weakened the non-Muslim citizens will rebel against the state and take even undue revenge of their previous subjugation as happened in Spain or is happening in India

which has been more intensified after the division of the sub-continent.

I certainly do not mean that Aggressive Jihad should never be done. Rather, I believe that Jihad is obligatory against hostile, non-compromising, non-Muslim states if Muslims have enough power to carry it out, so that their force is broken and they do not obstruct the preaching of Islam. Aggressive Jihad is not advisable against those non- hostile and compromising non-Muslim states who allow preaching of Islam in their territories particularly these days when territorial subjugation is generally condemned in the world, contrary to the times when capture of land was common, it was a credit to the attribute of the kings and rulers. The Aggressive Jihads of the major part of Islamic history all belong to the same period. However, Muslims must attain their martial superiority and keep expanding it so that non-Muslim states remain subdued “for fear of Jihad”, to say nothing of actual Jihad. The Qur'an also commands to acquire and maintain the military strength. In the past despite the common practice of fighting for victory, earlier victories of Muslims were distinguished from those of other nations. Victories of other nations were meant only to show their strength and grandeur, and, in your terminology, to fulfill their lust and greed. But Muslims did not have colonialist intentions (except for Arabia, Iran and Rome where expansionism was somewhat required). But their main intention was Propagation of the Message of Allah through preaching and inviting to this message. The safest way of doing it, at that time, was expansion of state.

Hence Qari Tayyab has said, “The companions (of the Prophet) apparently waged wars but their aim used to be propagation of the Message of Allah. If their aim had been territorial expansion they would not have made treaties allowing the opponents to continue their rule and only permit the Muslims to preach Islam unobstructed. They were assured that no one will be forced to accept Islam. People will be free to accept or reject it. Those who accepted such a treaty no concern was shown to them. If territorial expansion was aimed at such a treaty would not have been needed and their country would have been captured.... Any way when non-Muslims became bound by a treaty or agreement or became subjects they were let free because the real purpose was propagation of the Kalimah of Allah to the extent of preaching” (Qari Tayyab and his lectures. Part I, pp 237, 238.)

I have underlined my thoughts and those that were in agreement with mine to make it easy for you to reply. “I hope you are feeling well”.

Yours humbly,  
Syed Badr us Salam, Jeddah.

### **Answer from Moulana Muhammad Taqi Usmani:**

Respected Sir,

Asslam-o-Alaikum wa Rahmatullah-wa- Barakatuhu.

I am in receipt of your esteemed letter. Whatever you have written about Jihad can be summarized as this “If a non-Muslim state allows for preaching Islam in its country, Jihad against it does not remain lawful.” If this is what you mean, my humble self does not agree with it. Obstruction in the way of preaching Islam does not mean only a legal obstacle, but greater power or domination of a non-Muslim state against Muslims is by itself a great obstacle in the propagation of Islam. There are no legal restrictions in most of the countries today on preaching Islam, but since their grandeur and authority is established in the world, it has led to developing a universal feeling which forms a greater obstacle than the greatest legal binding in the way of free propagation of Islam.

For this reason the most important purpose of Jihad is to break this grandeur so that the resulting psychological subordination should come to an end and the way of accepting the Truth becomes smooth. As long as this grandeur and domination persists, the hearts of people will remain subdued and will not be fully inclined to accept the religion of Truth. Hence Jihad will continue. The Qur'an said:

فَإِنَّمَا يُعَذِّبُ اللَّهُو عَذَابُ يَوْمٍ أَعْلَمُ مِمَّا يَعْمَلُونَ وَلَا يَعْلَمُونَ مَا كَفَرُوكُمْ أَنَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَلَا  
يَدْرِيُونَ دِينَ الْحَقِّ بَلِ الظَّالِمُونَ أَوْ أَنْكَابَ حَتَّىٰ يُعْلَمُوا بِعِزْزِيَّةِ اللَّهِ عَنْ يَدِهِ وَهُمْ مَا عُرِدُوا هـ  
(سورة التوبة: ٢٩)

Here, killing is to continue until the unbelievers pay Jizyah after they are humbled or overpowered. If the purpose of killing was

only to acquire permission and freedom of preaching Islam, it would have been said “until they allow for preaching Islam.” But the obligation of Jizyah and along with it the mention of their subordination is a clear proof that the purpose is to smash their grandeur, so that the veils of their domination should be raised and people get a free chance to think over the blessings of Islam.

Imam Razi has written the following commentary on this verse:

“The purpose of “Jizyah” is not to let the unbelievers stay in their contumacy against Islam but sparing their lives to give them a chance for a time during which they may hopefully get convinced of the truth of Islam and embrace it. So when an unbeliever is given time wherein he would be observing the respect and honor of Islam, and hearing the arguments of its validity, and also observing the baselessness of disbelief, these things would convince him to turn towards Islam. This, in fact, is the real purpose of legalizing Jizyah.

The other question worthy of notice is: Do we find an example that the Prophet (PBUH) and his companions ever sent any missionary groups in other countries before Jihad and waited for their reaction to allow or disallow the missionary work? Did they go for Jihad only when they were refused to carry out the missionary work for Islam? Was any mission sent to Rome before attacking them? Was any attempt made to avoid Jihad against Iran and did they contend on seeking a permission for preaching Islam for that purpose? Obviously it was not so. Thus there can be no other conclusion that only a permit for missionary activities was not the aim. If that would have been the only aim many of the bloody combats could be stopped only on one condition that no obstacle would be placed in the way of the mission of Islam. But at least in my humble knowledge there has not been a single incident in the entire history of Islam where Muslims had shown their willingness to stop Jihad just for one condition that they will be allowed to preach Islam freely. On the contrary the aim of Muslims as declared by them in the battle of Qadsia was, “To take out people from the rule of people and put them under the rule of Allah”. Similarly, the Qur'an said:

وَقَاتِلُوهُمْ حَتَّىٰ لَا يَكُونُ فِتْنَةٌ وَرَبِّكُونَ الظَّبَابُ مُلَّهُ بِلَّهِ

“And (you O Believers) fight them until persecution is no more and the Din is all for Allah.” (8:39)

In the exegesis of this verse my reverend father Mufti Muhammad Shafi has written:

“The meaning of religion is “Authority and domination”. Thus the meaning of this verse would be that Muslims should continue until the Muslims are safeguarded against their contumacy, and the religion of Islam becomes a dominating power so that it offers protection to Muslims from the atrocities and mischiefs of others.”

He further said:

“The nutshell of this explanation is that Jihad against the enemies of Islam is obligatory on Muslims until the danger of their mischief or evil- doings is over, and the domination of Islam is established over all other religions. Since this will occur only near the end of the world, the command of jihad remains till the last day.” (Ma’arif ul Qur’ān Vol 4, Pg33)

In short, my humble self is of the view that the purpose of Jihad is not just to get the right of missionary activities in any country, but it aims at breaking the grandeur of unbelievers and to establish that of Muslims. As a result no one will dare to show any evil designs-against Muslims on one side and on the other side, people subdued from the grandeur of Islam will have an open mind to think over the blessings of Islam. Factually, this aims at safeguarding Islam. It is for this reason that the scholars who have called Jihad “A Protection” must be looked in the above context. But the basic element of this “protection” is to break the grandeur of unbelievers and establish the authority of Islam. Hence this basic element cannot be excluded from it. I think that all Ulema (Religious scholars) have established the same concept about the purpose of Jihad.

Moulana Idrees Kandhalvi stated:

“By commanding Jihad Allah does not mean that all the unbelievers be killed outright, but the aim is that the religion of Allah should dominate the world, and Muslims live with honor and dignity, and obey and worship Allah in peace and tranquility and there be no danger from unbelievers to interfere in the religion of

Islam. Islam is not in enmity with the personal existence of its enemies. It resists such a grandeur and power that may become a threat for Islam and Muslims.” (Seerat-ul-Mustafa vol: 2, p. 388)

At another place he writes:

“The implication of this verse is an obligation imposed on Muslims to fight against the unbelievers till the disorder and mischief cease to exist and the religion of Allah becomes supreme. By ‘mischief, in this verse, is meant the mischief anticipated from the grandeur and power of disbelief. And “The religion is all for Allah” means the exhibition and domination of religion, while in another verse it is stated,

وَقَاتِلُوكُمْ حَتَّىٰ لَا تَكُونُ فِتْنَةً وَّلَا يَكُونَ الظَّاهِرُ كُلُّهُ لِيَكُلُّهُ

that is, the religion of Islam should gain so much domination and power that it may not be subdued by the power of infidelity and the religion of Islam becomes fully secure from the mischief and danger of disbelief” (Ibid voL 2, p.386)

If the need for Jihad was abandoned just on getting the permission of Tableegh (Missionary activities), then we see that Muslims already have this permission in most of the non -Muslim countries of the world (It is a pity that this permission is not given in some Muslim countries) which implies that Muslims should never have to lift the sword. As a result disbelievers may establish and hoist flags of grandeur all over the world and their awfulness and supremacy on the people would stay dominating. The policies will be theirs, the commandments will be theirs, ideologies will be theirs, views will be theirs and the strategies will be theirs, yet the Muslims would have to be contended with the permission for their missionaries to enter those countries. The question arises how many people would be prepared to listen to the Muslims or give a serious thought to their speeches and writings in an atmosphere where disbelief had established its grandeur and awe throughout. How can the efforts of Muslim missionaries be effective in an atmosphere where anti-Islamic doctrines are being spread on the strength of political power with full vigor, and their propagation carried out with means not possessed by Muslims?

If however, Islam and Muslims attain such a power and grandeur against which the power and grandeur of disbelievers be subdued or at least it may be unable to create sedition and mischief mentioned above, then, of course, mutual compromise through peace treaties with non-Muslim countries is not against injunctions of Jihad. Like wise as long as the required capabilities for breaking the grandeur of disbelief are not possessed by Muslims, peace agreements with other countries, along with all efforts to accumulate the sources of power, are indeed lawful. In other words, there can be two types of agreement with non-Muslims.

- 1) Mutual compromise and peace agreements can be made with countries that have no power which could threaten the grandeur and domination of Muslims. This will be enforced as long as they do not become a threat to the Muslims again.
- 2) If Muslims do not possess the capability of “Jihad with power” agreement may be made till the power is attained. My article published in March, 1971 as referred to by you, pertains to these particular types of agreements. The excerpts of the article published in June, 1981 pertain to the state where the grandeur of unbelievers dominates over the Muslims. Hence your expression that, “Aggressive Jihad is obligatory against hostile, and non-compromising non-Muslim states subject to capability, so that their power breaks and they do not form obstacles in the way of Muslim Missionary works. Jihad is not advisable against non-hostile and compromising non-Muslim states who allow freedom of missionary activities” It is correct if it means what I explained above. But if it means that just by permitting missionary activities a non-Muslim state becomes ‘non-hostile and compromising’ and Jihad against them does not remain lawful or desirable, then in my view this is not correct. Arguments in favour of my view have already been advanced.

As for your deliberation that “... Particularly these days 1 when territorial expansion is generally condemned, contrary to the times when conquering the land was common, which was regarded as a credit to the attribute of the kings and rulers. The Aggressive Jihads forming the major parts of Islamic history all belong to the same era.” With all the respects for you I strongly condemn it, because, if this is taken to be correct it would mean that Islam does

not have a measure to determine a thing as good or bad. If a bad thing is counted as an “essential attribute” at the particular time Islam would begin to march on the footsteps of this practice and when people begin to condemn it at another time Islam would also follow the suit. The question is whether Aggressive battle is by itself is commendable or not? If it is, why the Muslims should stop simply because territorial expansion in these days is regarded as bad? And if it is not commendable, but deplorable, why Islam did not stop it in the past? Did it continue to practice because this was regarded as a creditable attribute of the kings”?

In my humble opinion this interpretation of the Aggressive Jihad of Islamic history is extremely incorrect and far away from the facts. Even in those days when this thing was considered to be a creditable “Attribute of the kings” aggressive Jihads were waged not because it was customary for that period of time but because it was truly commendable for establishing the grandeur of religion of Allah. There were other “Attributes of the kings” that in the excitement of victory they never made any distinction between women, children and old people when persecuting them. But Islam did not encourage it just because it was customary. On the contrary Islam not only framed such military rules and regulations but also practically enforced them as could not even be imagined by the “kings”. These were a matter of great surprise and rather unbelievable for the people who had not only become used to the barbarism of those kings but also became their admirers.

Aggressive Jihad is lawful even today for the purpose it was lawful in those days. Its justification cannot be veiled only because the peace-loving inventors of Atom Bombs and Hydrogen Bombs label it as “Expansionism” and resent those who have put the chains of slavery around the necks of the people of Asia and Africa. They are still bleeding under these heavy chains.

With due apologies, I may point out that it seems to me the result of the grandeur of the paganism that people have fixed their standard of good and bad on the basis of the propaganda which produces a lie as truth and truth as lie and then causes it to work into the minds of people to the extent that, to say nothing of non-Muslims, the Muslims themselves are overawed and inclined to adopt an apologetic attitude. If breaking such grandeur of falsehood and evil comes under the definition of “Expansionism”

we should venerate the blame of this expansionism with complete self-confidence, rather than stand humble before them as though saying, “when you thought that Aggressive Jihad was good we practiced it, but since you have started condemning it in your books and only in books... ..We have also forbidden it on ourselves.”

My humble self can never agree with this way of thinking.

Humbly yours,

Muhammad Taqi Usmani.